National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE CONCEPTION OF KNIGHTHOOD IN THE WORKS OF HARTMANN VON AUE AND GOTTFRIED VON STRASSBURG WITH EMPHASIS ON GOTTFRIED'S TRISTAN - A RE-EVALUATION

BY

Hans Juergen Doerle ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **MASTER OF ARTS in GERMAN LITERATURE.**

DEPARTMENT OF GERMANIC LANGUAGES

Edmonton, Alberta
SPRING 1995

National Library of Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA TO REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA DE REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-612-01506-8

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: **Hans Juergen Doerle**

TITLE OF THESIS: **The Conception of Knighthood in the Works of Hartmann von Aue and Gottfried von Straßburg with Emphasis on Gottfried's Tristan - A Re-evaluation**

DEGREE: **Master of Arts**

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1995

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion therof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

SIGNED) Hans J. Doerle

#1714-10020-103 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
T5J-0G8

January 24, 1995

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled **The Conception of Knighthood in the Works of Hartmann von Aue and Gottfried von Straßburg with Emphasis on Gottfried's Tristan - A Re-evaluation** submitted by **Hans Juergen Doerle** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of **Master of Arts in German Literature.**

Eugene Egert

Dr. Eugene Egert

Marianne Henn

Dr. Marianne Henn

Dr. Stephen Reimer

DATE: January 24, 1995

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my beloved grandmother, Emma Dörle née Fuchs (November 4, 1906-January 7, 1986).

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to re-evaluate the conception of knighthood in Gottfried von Straßburg's Tristan by means of a close textual analysis. In addition, the works of Hartmann von Aue (Erec and Iwein) will be used to illustrate how Gottfried's presentation of knighthood differs from that of Hartmann, who is his contemporary.

The first chapter reviews the various interpretations of Gottfried's Tristan with regard to Gottfried's conception of knighthood. The singling-out of Gottfried's bourgeois status to explain his apparent inability or unwillingness to depict the type of knighthood that his contemporaries do is shown to be based upon the mistaken assumption that the bourgeois-knight relationship was one of rivalry. Furthermore, it is shown that emphasizing Gottfried's social status will not lead to further insight into his view of knighthood.

The second chapter discusses Hartmann's Erec and Iwein, which are shown to depict knights who are flawed from the beginning. Their shortcomings as members of the Arthurian court also exemplify its shortcomings. Only by transcending the realm of Arthurian knighthood do they become perfect knights.

The third chapter analyzes Gottfried's Tristan and compares it to its source work, Tristram and, where relevant, to Erec and Iwein. Tristan is shown to be deficient at the outset in terms of knightly prowess. He manages, however, in the course of the work to integrate his humanistic-courtly self with his knightly self.

The fourth chapter summarizes the findings. Erec and Iwein are both imperfect knights who, in overcoming their imperfections, also transcend Arthurian knighthood and thereby implicitly criticize it. Tristan is also an imperfect knight. He, however, transcends the pre-courtly knighthood which was characteristic of his father, Riwalin. Gottfried's realistic depiction of knighthood is shown to be a product of the poet's pragmatism rather than a rejection of knighthood.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to hereby express my gratitude to the following people.

Firstly, I would like to thank my friends, Alan Wilman and Muriel Maitland for their support and words of encouragement. I truly value their friendship.

Secondly, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Eugene Egert, for his advice, encouragement, constructive criticism, and, above all, patience.

Thirdly, I would also like to thank the other two members of my examining committee, Drs. Marianne Henn and Stephen Reimer for their helpful suggestions.

Fourthly, I would like to thank Dr. Richard d'Alquen who, though he was unable to be on my examining committee, nonetheless provided me with very useful suggestions that helped to improve this thesis.

Lastly, I would like to thank Dr. Manfred Prokop for helping me to become computer literate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

CHAPTER II. HARTMANN VON AUE'S Erec..... 12

A. Life at Arthur's Court..... 13

1. Battle with Iders..... 20

2. The Tournament..... 28

B. Life Outside Arthur's Court..... 33

1. Battle with the Bandits..... 37

2. Battle with Galoein..... 38

3. First Battle with Guivreiz..... 41

4. Battle with Giants..... 46

5. Battle with Count Oringles..... 47

6. Second Battle with Guivreiz..... 49

C. Joie de la curt/Battle with Mabonagrin.... 52

D. Summary..... 58

CHAPTER III. HARTMANN VON AUE'S Iwein..... 60

A. Early Knighthood..... 60

1. Battle with Ascalon..... 66

2. Marriage to Laudine..... 74

3. Battle with Keii..... 76

4. Gawan's Advice to Iwein..... 77

B. Life After Disgrace at Arthur's Court..... 81

1. Iwein's Madness..... 82

2. Battle with Count Aliers..... 87

C. Iwein - Knight with the Lion..... 90

1. Battle with the Giant Harpin..... 95

2. Abduction of Ginover..... 99

3. Battle with the Steward..... 102

4. Battle with the Giants/Devil's Henchmen. 105

5. Final Battle with Gawan..... 112

D. Summary..... 118

CHAPTER IV. GOTTFRIED VON STRASSBURG'S Tristan..... 121

A. Riwalin..... 130

B. Rual li Foitenant..... 142

C. Tristan's Early Life..... 143

1. Education..... 145
2. Life at Court..... 150
3. The Investiture..... 154
D. Tristan's Battles as a Knight..... 165
1. Battle with Morgan..... 170
2. Battle with Morold..... 179
3. Battle with The Giant Urgan..... 194
4. War in Arundel/Life as a Mercenary..... 199
E. Summary..... 207
CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION..... 209
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....217

I. INTRODUCTION

The complexity of Gottfried von Straßburg's Tristan has resulted in a variety of interpretations of the work as well as of its protagonist. Wolfgang Mohr, for instance, focuses upon Tristan's various artistic endeavours and views him as the consummate artist.[1] John Anson notes that "more than through any other imagery it is through [the] language of the hunt that Gottfried expresses his allegory of love."[2] Within this context, Tristan is seen to be a "hunter of love." Helmut de Boor believes that Gottfried has intentionally replaced God with "minne" as the "pinnacle of existence" and that Tristan and Isolde may, therefore, be viewed as "minne saints."[3] And, C. Stephen Jaeger, who describes the work as "a synthesis of Medieval Humanism and courtly romance," sees in Tristan a precursor of the Renaissance man.[4]

From the variety of interpretations of Tristan, it becomes clear, then, that there has been very little consensus among critics about how to interpret the work as a whole. In 1940 de Boor noted that

> . . . Im Gegensatz zu Wolfram und dem Nibelungenlied ist es noch nicht gelungen, auch nur die Zugangswege deutlich abzustecken, die zu einer Erfassung von Gottfrieds Werk als 'Ausdrucksganzem' führen können.[5]

Even nearly half a century later, little progress appears to

---

[1] Wolfgang Mohr, "Tristan und Isolde als Künstlerroman," Euphorion 53 (1959): 153-174.

[2] John S. Anson, "The Hunt of Love: Gottfried von Straßburg's Tristan As Tragedy," Speculum 45 (1970): 600.

[3] Helmut de Boor, "Die Grundauffassung von Gottfrieds Tristan," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 18 (1940): 276.

[4] C. Stephen Jaeger, Medieval Humanism in Gottfried von Straßburg's Tristan und Isolde, (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag, 1977) 21.

[5] Helmut de Boor 262.

have been made in arriving at an all-encompassing interpretation of Tristan. In 1981 Weber pointed out

> So dürfte es auch in diesem Bereich eine der Erkenntnisse der neueren Bemühungen um Gottfrieds 'Tristan' sein, daß keine pauschalen Urteile möglich sind, sondern differenzierte Urteile nottun, was in sich schließt, daß sie jeweils nur eine partielle Gültigkeit beanspruchen können.[6]

In light of such views, this thesis will not attempt to interpret Gottfried's Tristan as a whole, but, rather, it will restrict itself to an examination of Gottfried's conception of knighthood. This should, nonetheless, contribute to a better understanding of the whole work.

Literary criticism in this area has long regarded Tristan as being a work which rejects knighthood:

> Gottfried ist bewußt bestrebt, das höfische Leben zu entrittern.[7]

> In der Tat spielt für das ganze Werk das Ritterliche keine entscheidende Rolle.[8]

> Gottfried portrays knights as either courageous failures or poltroons. The only exception is Tristan, and he . . . breaks every rule in the book.[9]

There are a number of reasons which have led critics to draw this conclusion. One of these reasons is Tristan's

---

[6] Gottfried Weber und Werner Hoffmann, Gottfried von Straßburg, 5th edition. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1981 89.

[7] Helmut de Boor, Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang 1170-1250, (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953) 135.

[8] Karl O. Brogsitter, Artusepik, (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965) 106.

[9] Michael S. Batts, Gottfried von Straßburg, (New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1971) 77-78.

investiture.[10] The point in the text is reached where Tristan is about to be dubbed a knight. Here one would expect an elaborate description of the investiture ceremony and of its participants. Instead, in a typical humility formula Gottfried claims to be unable to do justice to such a description:

> ine wiste wie gevâhen an,
> daz ich von rîcheite
> sô guotes iht geseite,
> mane haete baz dâ von geseit. (Tristan 4612-15)

He then appears to replace such a description with a literary excursus in which he passes judgement on his literary contemporaries. Several critics view this action as being indicative of Gottfried's attitude toward knighthood, namely that he rejects it. Brogsitter may serve as one example:

> Das Heldisch-Ritterliche [wird] abgewertet, ja fast ironisiert. Bezeichnend dafür ist, daß Gottfried die Gelegenheit der Schwertleite nicht zu einer ausmalenden Schilderung nutzt, sondern statt dessen, den berühmten 'Literaturkatalog' einschiebt.[11]

During the course of the literary excursus Gottfried is particularly critical of an unnamed poet, to whom he refers as a "vindaere wilder maere, der maere wildenaere" (Tristan 4665-66). This poet is generally believed to be Wolfram von Eschenbach, one of the leading proponents of the chivalrous

---

[10] Gottfried von Straßburg, Tristan, 3rd edition in 3 volumes ed. and trans. Rüdiger Krohn (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1984) lines 4547-5068. All subsequent references to this work will appear in the text of the paper as Tristan with line numbers. A more detailed discussion of the investiture scene will appear in Chapter IV.

[11] Brogsitter 106. Cf. W. T. H. Jackson, "The Artist in Gottfried's Poem," Publications of the Modern Language Association 77 (1962): 365. Cf. Cecil A. M. Noble, ed., "Gottfried von Straßburg's Tristan und Isolt- Courtly and Uncourtly," Cecil A. M. Noble: Spielbewußtsein. Essays zur deutschen Literatur und Sprache. Bern: Verlag Peter Lang AG, 1981 91.

life. Gottfried's criticism of him is usually viewed as further evidence of Gottfried's rejection of knighthood.[12]

Another reason for believing Gottfried to be espousing an anti-knightly sentiment concerns the various battle scenes in Tristan. They are, for the most part, quite realistic and lack much of the idealism that is to be found in similar battles in the other courtly romances:

> Die Kampfschilderungen entbehren bei ihm allen ritterlichen Glanzes; eher wird nüchtern das oft rein Zufällige im Ausgange angedeutet und beim Titelhelden Tristan mehr Nachdruck auf seine Klugheit und Verschlagenheit als auf seine Stärke und seine ritterlichen Eigenschaften gelegt.[13]

W. T. H. Jackson emphasizes as well that these battles are not as "clean" as the battles in the other courtly romances.[14]

Related to the question of Gottfried's views concerning knighthood are his views concerning the court and courtly life. Most critics are divided about whether Gottfried rejects the court and its conventions, though the anti-courtly argument does appear to predominate:

> The material of Gottfried's story belongs to the Arthurian cycle and the milieu in which it is set is courtly, but the meaning of the tale is diametrically opposed to courtly ideology, for Gottfried is one of those mediaeval poets who rejected the chivalric illusion, seeing the

---

[12] Batts 20.

[13] Brogsitter 106.

[14] W. T. H. Jackson, The Anatomy of Love. The Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971) 155. Note that Jackson fails to mention that the other courtly romances also contain battles which are anything but "clean." One need only think of Iwein's battle with King Ascalon or of Parzival's battle with Ither or of Erec's battles with the bandits and with Duke Galoein.

pretentiousness and inhumanity of it.[15]

Critics such as Stein, however, do believe Tristan to be a work that is in keeping with courtly conventions:

> Das höfische Leben und seine Ideale werden durchaus als Werte gesehen--daß sie von einzelnen Individuen dieser Welt nicht verwirklicht werden, ändert an dieser Tatsache nichts.[16]

At the centre of this controversy is the love portrayed in Tristan. This love consists of an adulterous (and therefore believed by many critics to be anti-courtly)[17] extra-marital affair between Tristan and Isolde. In addition, as W. T. H. Jackson has pointed out, this love appears to have no connection with Tristan's deeds of arms:

> He is never called on to defend Isolde's honor in fight or to use his skill as a warrior in defense of any female. Quite the contrary. The parts of his existence are carefully separated and his skill in battle is often more of an impediment than an assistance to his love plans.[18]

The allusion to this love by Gottfried in the prologue

---

[15] Dieter Welz, " The Spirit of Adventure in MHG. Romances of the Arthurian Cycle. Hartmann von Aue and Gottfried von Straßburg," English Studies in Africa 16 (1973): 80. N.B. Welz coins the phrase "anti-society romance" to describe Tristan. Cf. Noble 85. Cf. Jackson, The Anatomy of Love 1. Cf. Ruth Goldschmidt Kunzer, The Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg. An Ironic Perspective, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973) 198.

[16] Peter K. Stein, "Tristans Schwertleite. Zur Einschätzung ritterlich-höfischer Dichtung durch Gottfried von Straßburg," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 51 (1977): 336. Cf. Herbert Kolb. "Der Hof und die Höfischen. Bemerkungen zu Gottfried von Straßburg," Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum 106 (1977): 242.

[17] It is interesting to note that although this love appears to violate the tenets of courtly love, courtly love itself (though never consummated) is also an adulterous type of love. Northrop Frye, Sheridan Baker, and George Perkins, The Harper Handbook to Literature (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1985) 127.

[18] Jackson, The Anatomy of Love 143.

has created additional controversy. Gottfried essentially dedicates his work to a select group among his audience known as the "edelen herzen" (Tristan 47) as opposed to "ir aller werlde" (Tristan 50). A close reading of the text shows that Gottfried intends his work for those who know that true love is not possible without sorrow. The fact, however, that Gottfried addresses a select group instead of the entirety of courtly society has led many a scholar to view the prologue as further evidence of Gottfried's alleged rejection of the court.[19] Perhaps the last word concerning the "edelen herzen" should be left to W. T. H. Jackson who has correctly deduced that

> The edele herzen are Gottfried's sympathizers, nothing more. If they understand, they belong to the company.[20]

Having dealt briefly with Gottfried's allegedly anti-knightly/anti-courtly stance, a few words should be said about what the critics attribute this stance to. Many scholars use Gottfried's alleged social status as a frame of reference in this regard. These scholars, believing Gottfried to belong to the bourgeois class, claim, for the most part, that this is the reason for his anti-chivalrous attitude. They believe that Gottfried, as a bourgeois, was either not familiar enough with the knightly conventions to describe them adequately in his work or that he simply opposed knighthood and therefore sought to mock it and rob it of its glory. These two arguments have been used to explain everything from Gottfried's supposedly lacklustre battle descriptions to his omission of the investiture ceremony.

The first argument is easily refuted. A close reading of the text shows that Gottfried possessed a wealth of knowledge

---

[19] Noble 87. Cf. Welz 80. He believes that the "edelen herzen" are representative of a "world of free love and uninhibited pleasure" and thus are anti-courtly.

[20] Jackson, The Anatomy of Love 53.

in a variety of fields:

> Er kannte sich aus in Theologie, Mythologie, Musik, Rechtskunde, ritterlichen Bräuchen und höfischer Lebenshaltung.[21]

It is therefore inconceivable that Gottfried would have lacked the knowledge necessary to depict scenes of battle, etc.

The second argument, of which the following quotation is typical, is based upon the mistaken assumption that the bourgeoisie despised those of the knightly class:

> Er betrachtet die ritterliche Welt von außen, sieht ihre schöne, allzu schöne und glänzende Oberfläche, sieht sie als illusionären Schein, den es zu entlarven, den es zu desillusionieren gilt.[22]

In actuality, the upwardly mobile bourgeoisie looked to the knightly class for inspiration and used them as a role model:

> Diese Schicht betrachtete sich selbst als Stadtaristokratie und orientierte sich selbstverständlich an den Lebensformen des Adels. Man wird daher die Bezeichnung "bürgerlich" auch in diesem Zusammenhang mit großer Zurückhaltung und Vorsicht verwenden müssen.[23]

It becomes apparent, then, that there has been much bias present in Tristan research. Critics have ascribed a

---

[21] Gottfried von Straßburg, Tristan, vol. 3: Kommentar, Nachwort, und Register, ed. and trans. Rüdiger Krohn (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1981) 213.

[22] Georg Keferstein, "Die Entwertung der höfischen Gesellschaft im Tristan Gottfrieds von Straßburg," Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift 24 (1936): 425. Cf. Gustav Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters, vol. 2, part 2, 1st half (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927) 322. Cf. Peter Wapnewski, Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966) 64.

[23] Horst P. Pütz, "Auf der Suche nach der Aventiure," AUGIAS 23 (1986): 19. Pütz also mentions the fact that the bourgeoisie even organized its own tournaments (18).

viewpoint to Gottfried which they believe is representative of those belonging to the bourgeois class, namely an alleged repudiation of the knightly class. They then appear to view Tristan from this perspective, rather than simply viewing it as the artistic creation of an individual. They are, in other words, basing their observations on an anachronistic stereotype of the bourgeoisie. To make matters worse, they are, as has been shown earlier, using an uncharacteristic stereotype. Furthermore, it is not even certain whether Gottfried actually did belong to the bourgeois class:

> Nur Vermutungen können wir auch in bezug auf Gottfrieds Stand und Beruf äußern, über den in der Forschung noch keine Einigung erzielt ist. Übereinstimmung herrscht einmal darüber, daß Gottfried kein Ritter gewesen ist . . . .[24]

We must conclude, then, that a better understanding of Tristan cannot be gained until we stop viewing Gottfried as a member of a certain class and begin to view him simply as an individual.

In keeping with this approach, this thesis will undertake to examine and re-evaluate Gottfried's conception of knighthood in Tristan. The method employed will be a close textual analysis of Tristan, looking specifically at the various battle scenes involving Tristan as well as at any comments on the action by Gottfried, since it is primarily these scenes which critics have focused on in their criticism of Gottfried's portrayal of knighthood. As well, the focus on battle scenes is also due to the fact that the knight's behaviour in battle is one of the best indicators of how knightly or anti-knightly he is. In addition, comparisons will be made between Tristan and Hartmann's Erec and Iwein in order to ascertain whether Gottfried's view of knighthood differs radically from that of Hartmann. No reference will be made to the sources of these works with one exception. The

---

[24] Weber 4.

Tristan of Thomas of Brittany will be used to determine whether Gottfried deviated significantly from his source.[25]

Before an analysis of the various works can begin, a few words must be said about knighthood in general. In its strictest sense, the concept of knighthood refers to a member of the lower nobility, also known as a ministerial. However, in a broader sense, the concept of knighthood may also refer to a member of the lower classes fighting on horseback or even to a member of the upper nobility (i. e. a duke, prince, or king). In the courtly romances, which provide an idealized version of knighthood, the knights depicted usually belong to the upper nobility. Due to this dynamic concept of knighthood, there may be various definitions of knight. Thus, any general definition of knight or knighthood will have to be a compromise.

A knight is typically defined as a "Krieger gehobenen Standes, der in voller Rüstung mit Schild, Schwert [Lanze o. ä.] zu Pferd in den Kampf zieht."[26] A courtly knight is a knight who displays "eine vornehme Haltung, in der Heftigkeit und Leidenschaft gemäßigt [werden] durch den Respekt vor der Frau und vor jedem, der ihn um Hilfe [bittet], sogar vor dem Gegner."[27]

Since, however, two of the works to be examined in this thesis (i.e. Hartmann's Erec and Iwein) deal mainly with

---

[25] Since the remaining fragment of Thomas' work begins approximately where Gottfried's Tristan breaks off, reference will be made to the Old Norse translation of Thomas' text. Paul Schach, ed. and trans., The Saga of Tristram and Isönd (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1973). All subsequent references to this work will appear in the text of the paper as Tristram.

[26] Günther Drosdowski et al., eds., Meyers Enzyklopädisches Lexikon. Deutsches Wörterbuch, vol. 32 (Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut AG, 1981) 2169.

[27] Johanna Maria Van Winter, Rittertum: Ideal und Wirklichkeit (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1969) 73.

Arthurian knights, it becomes necessary to provide a definition of Arthurian knighthood. Unfortunately, an examination of the secondary literature suggests that very few literary critics have attempted to provide a clear and concise definition of Arthurian knighthood. One such attempt is by W. T. H. Jackson who simply lists the main elements of Arthurian knighthood. According to him, they are as follows: generosity (related to the Christian virtue of largitas which is the obligation of a wealthy person to share some of that wealth with the less fortunate); loyalty (usually to a liege lord, but also to a lady); honour (consisting of either one's reputation or conformity to some code of ethics); and moderation (known as mâze, which results from balancing of the various virtues).[28] As well, he notes the importance to the Arthurian knight of such things as great splendour, the never-ending search for noble deeds, a highly civilized code of behaviour, and the importance of the influence of ladies.[29] If one expands upon W. T. H. Jackson's attempt at a definition, Arthurian knighthood may be defined as a type of knighthood which is centred around the static world of the Arthurian court, led by King Arthur, and which is characterized by the aforementioned qualties. It will be of special interest to note, how, in my opinion, Hartmann, in his Erec and Iwein, builds upon Arthurian knighthood to form his own ideal of knighthood, and how Gottfried, in turn, builds upon Hartmann's conception of knighthood.[30]

It will become apparent, however, that for each of the

---

[28] W. T. H. Jackson, The Literature of the Middle Ages (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962) 88-92.

[29] Jackson 85.

[30] A statement summarizing Hartmann's formulation of his conception of knighthood from Arthurian knighthood will appear in the Summary section immediately following my examination of Iwein.

works to be analyzed in this thesis, we can formulate a different definition of what an exemplary knight should be, based upon each author's unique view of knighthood. Rather than trying to force each work to match a pre-determined, arbitrary definition of knighthood, which may not apply to every work, we will let the works themselves reveal what their respective authors thought that the role and function of a knight should be.

II. HARTMANN VON AUE'S Erec

It is appropriate that this thesis begin with an examination of the view of knighthood represented in the works of Hartmann von Aue (Erec and Iwein), for he is credited with having introduced the Arthurian romance into Germany.[1] Thus, what he has to say about knighthood will be of great interest to us not only because it will lead to a better understanding of his works, but also because it will serve as a typical and basic conception to compare with Gottfried's Tristan. The focal point of Hartmann literary criticism has tended to be mâze (moderation) and the emphasis Hartmann places upon it in his works. In 1927, Ehrismann noted

> Im Erec und Iwein zeichnet er [Hartmann von Aue] seelische Verwirrungen ritterlicher Helden, die durch Überschreitung des richtigen Maßes [my emphasis] hervorgerufen sind, und ihre Lösung durch tüchtige Pflichterfüllung.Damit sind sie als Leitbilder des richtigen weltlichen Lebens aufgestellt.[2]

Later, in 1953, de Boor observed

> In der maze und ihrer Bedeutung ist Hartmanns Wesen bestimmt: sie ist Harmonie in vernunfthaftem Ausgleich auf einer mittleren Linie.[3]

And, in 1979, Wapnewski stated

> Das Problem des 'Erek' ist der Konflikt zwischen minne und Ritterpflicht, zwischen Liebe und

---

[1] Paul Salmon, Literature in Medieval Germany (New York: Barnes & Noble Inc., 1967) 60.

[2] Gustav Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters, vol. 2, part 2, 1st half. (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927) 145. Cf. 164.

[3] Helmut de Boor, Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang 1170-1250 (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953) 73.

Herrscheramt.[4]

While not dismissing the importance of *mâze* in Hartmann's works, this thesis will attempt to avoid the pitfalls of forcing an interpretation of his works to match such a preconceived (though widely-held) notion.

The limitations of such an approach are quite evident in the literary criticism concerning Hartmann's *Erec*. Here, the focal point has been Erec's *verligen*, a problem many critics believe is related to lack of moderation. As Robert E. Lewis has astutely observed, this approach has led critics to view Erec as a "knight who falls from perfection as a result of the seductive charms of his wife," a view which, Lewis suggests, should "be thoroughly reexamined."[5]

This chapter, then, concentrating on the various battle scenes and related text passages, first in *Erec* and then in *Iwein*, will determine what Hartmann's view of knighthood is. Of particular interest will be how the protagonist reacts to each of the situations with which he is faced and whether he can be said to have changed during the course of his trials. It will also be of important to examine whether the hero's relationship to the Arthurian court changes significantly.

A. Life at Arthur's Court

Erec is in the company of Queen Ginover (wife of King

---

[4] Peter Wapnewski, *Hartmann von Aue*, 7th edition (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1979) 54. Cf. Peter Wapnewski, *Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966) 59.

[5] Robert E. Lewis, "Erec's knightly imperfections," *Res Publica Litterarum: Studies in the classical Tradition* 5.2 (1982): 158. Cf. Geoffrey See, "An Examination of the Hero in Hartmann's *Erec*," *Seminar. A Journal of Germanic Studies* 27.1 (1991): 39. See observes: "It would be more accurate to say, however, that the *verligen* is not itself the problem, but rather an important and obvious symptom of the problem. Erec displays obsessive behaviour even before the *verligen* episode, having a tendency to concentrate all his energies, or focus all his attention, on one thing at a time, to the exclusion and detriment of everything else."

Arthur) and her ladies-in-waiting just outside of Karadigan where Arthur and his entourage have set up camp. Queen Ginover sees a knight accompanied by a lady and a dwarf. With her curiosity getting the better of her, she decides that she must know who the knight is.[6] Erec intercedes here and asks Queen Ginover if he might be allowed to ride out and obtain the information for her. She refuses his request and sends, instead, one of her ladies-in-waiting. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the author refers to Erec as "Erec der junge man," (Erec 18) thereby implying that Erec is not only young in years, but also inexperienced in chivalry. One is almost tempted to compare the scene to that of a mother refusing her young son's request, since she knows that he lacks the maturity and experience to deal with whatever situation he may encounter. Another possibility is that she thinks the situation does not require sending a knight to investigate.

The lady-in-waiting sets forth and meets the dwarf, to whom she relays Queen Ginover's request. The dwarf, however, as one would expect of an uncourtly creature, refuses to comply (Erec 44-47). Instead, he begins to whip the lady-in-waiting, who, in her persistence, had attempted to block the dwarf's way. The queen is naturally distressed at what has just occurred. Erec is incensed that the knight did nothing to prevent what happened and correctly blames him for the dwarf's actions (Erec 66-69).

Erec again asks the queen for permission to obtain the information that she seeks. This time, she grants him his request, and he rides out to meet the dwarf. Erec, like Queen Ginover, asks for the name of the knight and the lady (Erec

---

[6] Hartmann von Aue, Erec: Mittelhochdeutscher Text und Übertragung, ed. and trans. Thomas Cramer (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1984) lines 14-17. All subsequent references to this work will appear in the text of the paper as Erec with line numbers.

80-82).

The response to Erec's request is not surprising. He, too, is whipped by the dwarf. But, Erec is unable to defend himself, since he is not wearing his armour (Erec 99-103). Lewis sees this embarrassing situation as the result of Erec's knightly naïvete, for he has presumably been entrusted with ensuring the safety of Gueen Ginover and her ladies-in-waiting, yet he fails to wear his armour.[7] It must be noted, however, that the text gives no indication that Erec is in any way responsible for protecting the queen. In addition, Erec's lack of armour is, in this instance, perfectly acceptable, since he is in the vicinity of the Arthurian court where wearing armour would only be required when a tournament is being held.

Erec must now bear the indignity (and the loss of honour associated with it) of being whipped by a dwarf in full view of the queen and her ladies-in-waiting. If the situation were not as serious as it is, it would be almost comical.

Erec, as an Arthurian knight, albeit a fledgling Arthurian knight, must, of course, restore his lost honour. He tells Queen Ginover

> ir gesehet mich nimmer mêre,
> ich engereche mich an disem man
> von des getwerge ich mâl gewan. (Erec 135-37)

The restoration of his lost honour, however, is a secondary goal. His primary objective is to avenge himself on the knight, whom he holds accountable for the dwarf's actions.

The queen is, of course, worried, since she knows that Erec is young and inexperienced:

> der küneginne was vil leit
> daz er alsô junger reit
> ûf sô grôze vreise:
> si bat in lân die reise [my emphasis].
> (Erec 144-47)

---

[7] Lewis 152.

Her plea, however, falls on deaf ears. Erec persists until she finally relents:

> sô lange er dô urloubes gerte
> unz daz si ins gewerte. (Erec 148-49)

Here again, a mother-son analogy seems particularly appropriate. The whole situation is reminiscent of a son who pleads with his mother for so long, that her resistance finally wears down and--despite her better judgement--she grants his request. The appropriateness of such an analogy suggests that Hartmann may have intentionally wished to convey such an image in order to further emphasize Erec's youth and persistence.

Erec now sets off in pursuit of the knight and his entourage. According to Lewis, his sudden departure reveals more of his knightly shortcomings. Erec did a poor job of protecting the queen and her retinue earlier and he now totally shirks his responsibility by leaving without first escorting them back to the safety of the Arthurian court.[8] It is important to realize, however, that Erec does ask for and is granted leave by Queen Ginover (Erec 148-49). In addition, she and her retinue are in the vicinity of the Arthurian court and thus they are at minimal risk. Erec, as well, does not return to the court for his armour, since he fears that the delay would result in the knight and the dwarf getting away (Erec 150-59). Although Erec's riding off after the knight without armour does not appear to be a very wise move (the knight does, after all, have armour), it is the only action open to him. He has been made to look like a fool in front of Queen Ginover herself and must now rectify the situation by following the knight and challenging him when he has an opportunity.

Thus, Erec follows the knight and his retinue. To his credit, he does not immediately confront the group, but,

---

[8] Lewis, 153.

instead, maintains a safe distance between himself and them[9]:

> vil schiere begunde er si ane sehen.
> zuo in enwas im niht ze gâch:
> er reit in alsô verre nâch
> daz er si sach und si in niht. (Erec 163-66)

They enter a town named Tulmein (owned by Duke Imain), and Erec immediately breaks off the chase, for he does not want to be spotted. This comedy of errors continues as Erec searches for a place to rest for the night, without having any money to pay for his lodging. Eventually, he stumbles upon an old, rundown building, which he believes to be deserted, and where he plans to spend the night, sleeping in a corner on the floor. The building, as it turns out, is actually the home of an impoverished nobleman named Koralus, his wife, Karsinefîte, and their daughter, Enite,who must act as stableboy for the family. Erec requests lodging, though to do so is painfully embarassing for him:

> mit zwîvel er zuo im sprach:
> 'herre, mir waere herberge nôt.'
> diu bete machete in schamerôt. (Erec 301-03)

Koralus graciously grants him lodging, for which Erec thanks him, though not without a bit of irony provided by Hartmann:

> des genâdete im Erec fil de roi Lac. [my emphasis]. (Erec 307)

Hartmann reminds us here that Erec's sudden departure has resulted in an Arthurian knight and son of a king, no less, being reduced to the status of a common beggar.

Having settled in somewhat, Erec learns from Koralus

---

[9] Cf. Lewis 153, who notes that Erec "stalks the group like a wolf, staying constantly just out of sight" and states further that his behaviour "seems petty and base, for instead of maintaining his rank and demeanor as a knight bound to a strict code of conduct, Erec has reduced himself to the level of a medieval guerilla fighter." While Lewis's point is well-taken, Lewis fails to mention that this unchivalrous behaviour is unavoidable, since Erec has no armour, and thus no way to defend himself, if he were to confront Iders at this time.

about Tulmein and the goings-on there. It turns out that an annual event is held at the castle--by Enite's uncle, Duke Imain--at which a courtly lady may claim a sparrowhawk and thus be recognized as the most beautiful lady at the tournament. Should there be any objections to her claim, then her knight would be challenged by another lady's knight. The victor's lady, then, would claim the sparrowhawk and thus, without further dispute, be proclaimed the most beautiful lady at the tournament. The knight Iders, whom Erec had been pursuing, has won the sparrowhawk for his lady for two consecutive years, and should he do so for a third time, then the sparrowhawk is indisputably his forever and, consequently, his lady deemed to be the most beautiful woman. His success seems assured, since Hartmann tells us that no one dares oppose him (Erec 210-17).

Now, one would expect Erec, in an act of generosity, to volunteer his services in order to rid Tulmein of Iders. Erec does volunteer his services, but not for anyone's benefit but his own. Self-absorbed as he is, Erec bears his soul to Koralus, relating the horrible indignity he suffered at the hands of the dwarf. He again blames Iders for what occurred, but, perhaps, more importantly, he reveals, yet again, that it is revenge he seeks:

> daz sol mîn herze immer klagen
> mir engevüege got noch den tac
> daz ich ez gerechen mac. [my emphasis]
> (Erec 489-91)

This is hardly the type of behaviour one would expect of an Arthurian knight. There is no mention of regaining his lost honour, only of his need for revenge. While the act of restoring one's lost honour and avenging oneself may be related acts (one does, after all, depend upon the other), it does seem that Erec stresses the revenge aspect of pursuing Iders, rather than the restoration of his honour. Seeking revenge is not only unchivalrous, but also un-Christian, since vengeance is God's prerogative.

To achieve his goal, Erec needs both armour (Erec 499-502) and a female companion, Enite (Erec 504-10), both of which he obtains from Koralus. In return, he promises to make Enite his wife:

> nû sehet ob ez müge sîn
> und tuotz ûf daz gedinge,
> ob mir alsô gelinge
> daz mir der sige belîbe. [my emphasis]
> sô nim ich si ze wîbe. (Erec 511-15)

The proviso that he will marry Enite, if he is successful in defeating Iders, stands out. Assuming that the battle to follow is not a battle to the death, and Hartmann gives us no indication that it is, it seems rather rude of Erec to suggest that Enite's future as his possible wife is contingent upon his success in the battle. He may, though, also be seeking to reassure Koralus that he would have to be successful in battle in order to be deserving of Enite. The question remains, however: If he were not successful, would he simply leave her to continue on as a stableboy for her poverty-stricken family? It appears so.

This condition which Erec places upon his offer of marriage serves to reinforce the view that Erec is self-centered, and that his primary goal is revenge. Enite, then, may be seen as just a means of achieving that end, like the armour is, rather than an end in herself.[10]

---

[10] Cf. Lewis 154, who notes that "Erec needs armor and weapons, and he volunteers to marry Enite in order to insure that he will get them." Cf. See 41, who states: "He views the marriage merely as payment for the armour." Cf. Norbert Sieverding, Der ritterliche Kampf bei Hartmann und Wolfram. Seine Bewertung im 'Erec' und 'Iwein' und in den Gachmuret- und Gawan-Büchern des 'Parzival' (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag, 1985) 13. Sieverding says the following regarding Enite: "Sie ist für ihn nicht mehr als ein Attribut für die Verwirklichung seiner Absichten benötigt." Cf. Hugo Kuhn, " 'Erec'." Hartmann von Aue eds. Hugo Kuhn and Christoph Cormeau (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973) 19. Kuhn acknowledges the fact that Erec offers to marry Enite so that he may challenge Iders. He believes, however,

In this connection, Erec's comment to Koralus that he truly wants Enite to be his wife (Erec 566-70) must be viewed with skepticism. In addition, to this point no mention is ever made of blossoming love between Erec and Enite. All we are told is that Enite is beautiful (Erec 323, 331-32, 336-41), and that Erec feels sorry for her (Erec 342). These are certainly not compelling reasons to enter into a marriage. Since love does not seem to be a motivating factor for Erec where Enite is concerned, it becomes clear that he is only using her in order to gain admission to the castle and to be allowed to challenge Iders.

The whole situation seems rather contrived. Erec obtains the outer trappings required of a knight, such as armour and a fair lady at his side. His actions and motivations indicate, however, that he is far from being a perfect knight. Furthermore, if we had not been aware of his Arthurian knightly status, it would be quite tempting to label Erec as a man impersonating a knight.

1. Battle with Iders

Erec, Koralus, and Enite arrive at Castle Tulmein and are warmly greeted by Duke Imain, who is Enite's uncle. Although somewhat taken aback by their arrival, Duke Imain readily agrees to assist them in any way he can:

> beide lîp unde guot
> unde willeclîcher muot
> sol iu dar zuo sîn bereit,
> her gast, durch iuwer vrümekeit
> und durch mîner nifteln êre. [my emphasis]

---

that Erec fights because he is truly convinced that Enite is more beautiful than Iders' amie. He states: "Allerdings sicherlich nicht einfach Gewalt gegen Gewalt setzend und nur seine Rache dabei verfolgend - obwohl Hartmanns und auch Crestiens ziemlich unliebenswürdige Darstellung diesem Eindruck nicht entgegnen - sondern aus der Voraussetzung, daß Enite wirklich die Schönere sei: das liegt objektiv im Zusammenhang gegeben und wird zudem bei Crestien auch ausgesprochen . . . " One cannot, however, ignore the fact that Enite is simply a means to an end for Erec.

(Erec 634-38)

Although Count Imain has been apprised of Erec's reason for being there, it becomes apparent that he, like Koralus, has been deceived into believing that Erec's intentions are honourable. While it is certainly true, as Duke Imain suggests, that Enite's honour is at stake (Erec 634-40), it is clear to the reader that Erec's intent is not to defend her honour, but rather, to avenge himself.

The recurring theme of Enite's attire serves to further illustrate this point. Count Imain wants to provide his niece with attire befitting a courtly ceremony. Erec intervenes by remarking that

> er haete harte missehen,
> swer ein wîp erkande
> niuwan bî dem gewande.
> man sol einem wîbe
> kiesen bî dem lîbe
> ob si ze lobe stât
> unde niht bî der wât. (Erec 643-49)

While a modern reader would not find fault with Erec's comments, a medieval audience certainly would. The large number of lengthy descriptions of clothing in the various courtly romances attests to the fact that clothing was certainly as important to a medieval audience as physical appearance. In a word, outer beauty appears to have been regarded as a fairly reliable indication of inner beauty.[11]

Seen in this light, Erec's comments betray his lack of judgement as to what is appropriate courtly convention. This applies to the conventions of the Arthurian court as well, which is illustrated by the fact that Queen Ginover

---

[11] Cf. Sieverding 15-16, who maintains that Erec's refusal to allow Enite to wear more suitable attire (as well as Erec's later victory over Iders in old armour) indicates that Erec is stressing the primacy of inner qualities over external form. Such a statement, I would think, does not take sufficiently into account, however, the differing perception of the medieval courtly mind.

immediately clothes Enite in more appropriate attire upon Erec's return with her to Arthur's court (Erec 1529-62).

That Erec forces Enite to appear dishevelled before courtly society does not indicate that he wished her to be humiliated: he is insensitive to her predicament. As we stated earlier, Erec does not love Enite. She is only with him because he requires her presence in order to challenge Iders.

After having attended mass, Erec enters court with Enite at his side. His first act, upon seeing Iders and his companion, is to tell Enite to take the sparrowhawk:

> 'vrouwe, loeset diu bant
> und nemet den sparwaere ûf die hant.
> wan daz ist wâr âne strît,
> hiest nieman schoener dan ir sît.'(Erec 686-89)

This act, combined with Enite's dishevelled appearance, is Erec's way of provoking Iders into a confrontation, which certainly does not appear to be a chivalrous way to enter into battle.

Iders reacts, of course, as expected. He is infuriated that Erec would permit Enite, who is dressed like a beggar, to grasp the sparrowhawk, which, in this context, symbolizes feminine beauty:

> dem ritter was daz ungemach.
> vil unwirdeclîche er sprach:
> 'lât den sparwaere stân!
> ez ensol iu niht wol ergân,
> ir dürftiginne. [my emphasis]
> (Erec 690-94)

Although Iders reacts angrily, he does so with just cause. Enite's attempt to take possession of the sparrowhawk--though instigated by Erec--represents a challenge to Iders personally.

It comes as no surprise, then, that upon hearing Erec's challenge (Erec 700-07), Iders informs Erec that if he does not leave, he will kill him (Erec 708-20). It is worth noting that Iders makes reference to Erec's youth, even going so far

as to label Erec's challenge childish (Erec 711), which, with respect to courtly etiquette, it is.

This recurring theme of Erec's youth has led several critics to emphasize Erec's youth as a mitigating factor in his, at times, unchivalrous behaviour. Boggs may serve as one example,

> Erec demonstrates that while he does possess all the qualities and abilities necessary to fulfill the obligations of knighthood, it is his youth which often prevents him from maintaining standards dictated by courtly convention. At this stage he is brash, impetuous, sometimes even rude, and lets personal feelings and goals guide his actions. Hartmann's Erec becomes in the first part of the epic a highly successful young knight who has yet to completely allow his feelings and actions to be dictated by his position in the Arthurian world.[12]

While it is true that Erec's youth--which Hartmann repeatedly emphasizes--helps to explain Erec's many instances of unchivalrous behaviour, it nevertheless does not excuse his behaviour. In addition, we must never lose sight of the fact that Erec is, for the longest time, the sole representative of Arthurian knighthood presented in this courtly romance. The fact that he was the only Arthurian knight in the company of Queen Ginover shows as well that, despite his age, Erec is a highly-valued member of the Arthurian court. Thus, his flaws must be viewed as representative, at least in part, of the flaws of the Arthurian court and of its knights.

Erec is, to say the least, ill-equipped to fight against

---

[12] Roy Boggs, "Hartmann's Erec," Innovation in Medieval Literature: Essays to the Memory of Alan Markman, ed. Douglas Radcliff-Umstead (Pittsburgh: Medieval Studies Committee, University of Pittsburgh, 1971) 54-55. Cf. William Henry Jackson, "The Tournament in the Works of Hartmann von Aue. Motifs, Style, Functions," Hartmann von Aue. Changing Perspectives: London Hartmann Symposium 1985, eds. Timothy McFarland and Silvia Ranawake. (Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1988) 246. Cf. A. Meng, Vom Sinn des ritterlichen Abenteuers bei Hartmann von Aue, (Zürich: Juris Verlag, 1967) 23.

a seasoned knight like Iders. Iders is outfitted with the very best armour and lances (Erec 732-45), while Erec must make do with his second-hand accoutrements (Erec 746-50). Erec does, however, make up for his lack of equipment by displaying such determination in battle that even Iders is somewhat dumbfounded by it all:

> diu tjost wart sô krefteclich
> daz diu ros hinder sich
> an die hehsen gesâzen.
> der muote was erlâzen
> der ritter Idêrs unz an die stunt:
> diu wart im sît garwe kunt. (Erec 774-79)

We are told of lances breaking as the two knights charge at each other until Erec is left with only one lance, that of Koralus. With this Erec makes his final charge at Iders, a charge which results in Iders being thrown from his steed (Erec 816-23). At this point Erec finally shows that he is capable of acting chivalrously. Instead of killing the now defenceless Iders, Erec allows him to get up off the ground, and the fight continues (Erec 831-35).

The two knights do battle with swords von vruo unz hin nâch mittem tage (Erec 883). Finally, Iders suggests a brief respite since their blows are no longer manlîch (Erec 904) and to continue in such a weakened state would only dishonour the institution of knighthood (Erec 898-903). After regaining their strength, Erec and Iders resume the battle at the same frenetic pace as before, and, just as before, the two men appear to be equally matched.

This seemingly endless battle takes a decisive turn when Erec recalls how he was disgraced earlier by the dwarf (Erec 927-39). This memory (and, to a lesser degree, Enite's presence) gives him added incentive to battle on more ferociously, until he finally defeats Iders.[13]

---

[13] Cf. See 42, who states: "It would appear then that it is the dread of being disgraced again (especially in front of a lady) which drives him on, rather than affection for

With Iders's defeat comes the resolution of Erec's need for revenge. Hartmann tells us that:

> sînen geiselstreich er rach. (Erec 950)

Thus, it is once again evident that Erec's sole purpose in initiating this battle with Iders was to seek revenge which, of course, also serves to restore his lost honour. Enite, though present, plays only a very minor role in inspiring Erec's victory. In this connection, Lewis correctly concludes the following about the battle with Iders:

> Although he also relies upon the beauty of Enite for encouragement (935-39), his desire for revenge spoils the purity of his inspiration. To this extent one must consider his victory over Iders to be flawed [my emphasis].[14]

There are still critics like Sieverding, however, who ignore the predominance of the revenge component:

> Kennzeichnend für die Motivation Erecs zum Kampf gegen Iders war die Verknüpfung individuellen Verlangens nach Ehre mit der Wiederherstellung der kollektiven Ehre des Artushofes.[15]

While I agree that Erec fights not only for himself, but also on behalf of the Arthurian court, honour is only of secondary importance in his desire to do battle with Iders.

In fact, Erec's desire for revenge nearly causes him to take Iders's life:

> als erm den helm abe brach,
> dô lôste erm ouch daz hüetelîn
> als er solde erslagen sîn,
> wan daz er des geruochte
> daz er genâde suochte. (Erec 951-55)

It must, of course, be acknowledged that Erec does spare Iders' life upon hearing his plea for mercy and extracting a promise of service from him. In addition, however, Erec

---

Enite."

[14] Lewis 154.

[15] Sieverding 21.

mentions Iders's earlier threats, and attempts to use them to justify taking Iders's life. By doing so, he fails to realize that the threats were uttered in response to his deliberate provocation of Iders (i.e. Enite's dishevelled appearance at court and claiming the hawk). Thus, as Boggs notes

> It is not Erec's, but Iders' conduct which remains in consonance with courtly rules.[16]

There are, critics, however, who disagree by focusing on Erec's few instances of chivalrous behaviour up to this point and, thus, siding with him rather than with Iders. One such critic is de Boor, who states the following with respect to Erec's behaviour:

> Sein Verhalten sowohl im Augenblick der Ehrenkränkung wie beim Siege zeigen ihn als einen Mann, der seine Leidenschaften und Triebe beherrscht [!] Als Träger von zuht und mâze [!] ist er gegen seinen hochfahrend unbeherrschten Gegner abgestuft und deswegen innerlich des Sieges wert.[17]

It is clear from our analysis of this battle, however, that de Boor's view of the battle ignores Erec's impulsive behaviour as well as the provocative nature of his actions. Although Iders is by no means a perfect knight (i.e. he is quite arrogant), he is certainly not the antithesis of zuht and mâze that de Boor makes him out to be.

Erec has the dwarf, Maliclisier, caned by two servants (Erec 1065-72) and Iders sent to Arthur's court to inform Queen Ginover of what has transpired and to apologize to her

---

[16] Boggs 54. Boggs views Erec as being "an emerging knight," one who is not yet a full member of Arthur's Round Table (52). In comparison, Chrétien's Erec is already a full-fledged knight at the beginning of his romance (50). Although this thesis will not deal with comparisons between Hartmann and his source, this footnote does serve to support our view of Hartmann's Erec.

[17] Helmut de Boor, Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang 1170-1250 (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953) 70.

for what was done to her and her lady-in-waiting.

Meanwhile, back at Arthur's court, Queen Ginover informs her returning husband, King Arthur, of Erec's departure. Iders and his entourage arrive shortly thereafter. Once at Arthur's court, Iders apologizes and puts himself at Queen Ginover's disposal. He reports that Erec will arrive the following day with a woman whose beauty is beyond compare (Erec 1255-59). What is interesting about this comment is that, though Enite's acquisition of the sparrowhawk entitles her to be known as the most beautiful woman in the land, her subsequent appearance at the Arthurian court in tattered clothing, as we mentioned earlier, certainly does not live up to the praise bestowed upon her by Iders. We learn as well that the Iders battle was Erec's first knightly deed of arms (Erec 1266), which is certainly not surprising to the astute reader.

At this point, Erec demonstrates generosity by sending Enite's poor father, Koralus, silver and gold (Erec 1806-19) and transferring title to him of two castles (Erec 1820-37). Two aspects regarding these acts of generosity are worth noting. Firstly, it should be remembered that Erec promised to marry Enite if successful against Iders, thus, his sudden generosity is his way of sealing the deal. Enite is now his "property," to do with as he wishes. In addition, it is also a face-saving gesture, since a future king cannot be seen to have an impoverished father-in-law. And, as always, we must remember that if Erec had been unsuccessful in battle, and lived to tell about it, the marriage would not have taken place. Secondly, it should be noted that Erec is quite generous with other people's money. The gold and silver that he gives to Koralus is a gift from Arthur, and the two castles belong to his father, King Lac. Thus, Erec's magnanimous gesture is really not so magnanimous after all!

In this connection, Hartmann mentions the love shared by Erec and Enite:

zewâre ich iu daz sagen wil,
dâ was der Minnen gewin:
diu Minne rîchsete under in
und vuocte in grôzen ungemach. (Erec 1857-60)

Upon closer examination, however, it becomes apparent that what Erec and Enite share is not minne in the sense of love, but rather, sexual attraction. In addition to stressing the sexual attraction between the two by suggesting that Erec and Enite could not wait for their first night of pleasure with one another (Erec 1847-50), Hartmann makes an interesting comparison:

dô einz daz ander ane sach,
dô enwas in beiden niht baz
dan einem habeche, der im sîn maz
von geschihte zougen bringet,
sô in der hunger twinget:
und als ez im gezeiget wirt,
swaz ers dâ vür mêre enbirt,
dâ von muoz im wirs geschehen
dan ob ers niht enhete gesehen. (Erec 1861-69)

By comparing Erec and Enite to a hawk and its prey, Hartmann not only reiterates the lack of true love between the two, but also alludes to the sensual nature of their relationship. There is at this stage no real caring between the two, but simply physical attraction.

2. The Tournament

After the festivities associated with Erec's and Enite's wedding have drawn to a close, a tournament is organized away from Arthur's court, at which various knights from across the land can display their knightly prowess. Erec, meanwhile, worries about how he will present himself at his very first tournament:

Erec fil de roi Lac
maneger gedanke phlac,
wie er dar sô kaeme
wan er vor der stunde
turnierens nie begunde.
vil dicke gedâhte er dar an,
in swelhem werde ein junger man
in den êrsten jâren stât,
daz er daz immer gerne hât. (Erec 2248-57)

While it is commendable that Erec should be concerned about his reputation and how he will present himself at the tournament, it is regrettable, and certainly ironic, that he did not entertain such thoughts prior to doing battle with Iders (i. e. He allowed Enite to appear in tattered clothing).

The tournament itself provides some interesting insights into Erec's character. On the first day of the tournament, Erec rushes out as early as possible in order to be the first to joust:

> vil kûme mitter tac,
> Erec fil de roi Lac
> der wâfente sich sâ
> ê iemen anderswâ,
> daz er die êrsten tjost naeme
> und in vür kaeme,
> swâ er des state vunde. (Erec 2414-20)

He encounters a total of five like-minded knights and proceeds to dismount all of them in rapid succession. While such behaviour may at first seem praiseworthy, William Henry Jackson's research indicates otherwise:

> Such informal jousting before the tournament is historically recorded, and it seems to have been a matter primarily for less experienced knights and for those who were eager to seize every opportunity for practice and for the winning of glory.[18]

Erec is certainly an inexperienced knight as well as eager for glory. Hartmann's own comments serve to support this view of Erec:

> ir rosse er niene ruochte,
> wan daz er vürbaz suochte
> ritterschefte mêre [my emphasis].
> (Erec 2430-32)

Although the pursuit of knightly combat is not in itself a

---

[18] William Henry Jackson, "The Tournament in the Works of Hartmann von Aue. Motifs, Style, Functions," Hartmann von Aue. Changing Perspectives: London Hartmann Symposium 1985, eds. Timothy McFarland and Silvia Ranawake (Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1988) 243.

negative character trait, our analysis of Erec's knightly conduct thus far reveals that he has a definite tendency to leap before he looks.

This, in addition to the fact that he has just been victorious in a pre-tournament practice and not in the tournament proper, reduces the significance of the praise that he has just received from the knights, who arrive for the tournament:

> si sprâchen alle: 'jâ, herre, wer
> mac disiu ros erlediget hân?
> ez hât benamen Erec getân.'
> vil wol wart er geprîset dâ. (Erec 2449-52)

The tournament proper begins, and Erec's behaviour continues in much the same vein. He is the first to joust in the morning and the last to joust at night. He stops only when it becomes too dark to see (Erec 2470-76). And, of course, he receives more ironic praise:

> dô man ze herberge kam,
> ander rede dô niemen phlac
> wan: 'Erec fil de roi Lac
> der ist der baz tuonde man
> den unser lant ie gewan
> von sînen jâren.
> er enmöhte baz gebâren.'
> des wart groezliche gejehen. (Erec 2477-84)

Lest anyone think that we have been too hasty in our judgement of Erec, the second day of the tournament serves to support our view of him. He is the first to ride out onto the tournament field and he again defeats a number of knights in the pre-tournament practice, only this time he does so without armour (all he takes with him is a shield). Hartmann's praise of such an irresponsible action can, again, only be viewed as ironic (Erec 2503-07).[19]

---

[19] Our view that Hartmann's praise of Erec's actions appears to be ironic is supported by Dennis Green who, in general, views all praise of Erec prior to his verligen at Karnant as ironic. Cf. Dennis H. Green, "Hartmann's Ironic Praise of Erec," Modern Language Review 70 (1975): 798.

In the second tournament proper, Erec is equally irresponsible. After a number of successful jousts, he takes a brief rest, during which his helmet is removed to enable him to cool off. Seeing that the other Arthurian knights are retreating from their opponents, in what appears to be a team tournament, Erec remounts his steed and rides off into battle without his helmet! Lewis has the following to say concerning this reckless act:

> This act of suicidal negligence reveals much about Erec [my emphasis]. Regardless of his strength, his bravery, and his noble intentions, Erec is still very immature. He is more than just a little wild; he is impetuous, foolhardy and precipitate.[20]

It also does not reflect well on Arthurian knighthood as a whole, when Hartmann notes that the Arthurian knights may have lost the contest were it not for Erec's help (Erec 2657-60). In this way, Hartmann criticizes Arthurian knighthood, since if the Arthurian knights are not able to win a contest of knightly prowess without the help of an inexperienced and overzealous knight like Erec (that is to say, if he is the best they have to offer), then they are certainly less than ideal representatives of knighthood per se.

The final challenger to face Erec is a knight named Roiderodes. During the course of this battle, Erec changes horses a number of times, so that by the time he has defeated Roiderodes, he is riding his fifth horse. Since his opponent does not do likewise, we may assume, then, that this was not standard practice at a tournament and that Erec's behaviour may, therefore, be regarded as erratic. Lewis views Erec's behaviour similarly and cites it as an example of Erec's "instability as a knight."[21]

The tournament comes to an end, and Erec is praised yet

---

[20] Lewis 155.

[21] Lewis 155.

again:

> den prîs hete er dâ bejaget,
> und den sô volleclîchen
> daz man begunde gelîchen
> sîn wîsheit Salomône,
> sîn schoene Absolône,
> an sterke Samsônes genôz.
> sîn milte dûhte si sô grôz,
> diu gemâzete in niemen ander
> wan dem milten Alexander. (Erec 2813-21)

Hartmann's use of irony comes here once again to the fore. To compare Erec's wisdom to that of Solomon is equivalent to calling fighting with partial or no armour the act of a wise man. In addition, Hartmann's comparison of Erec with Absalom is also ironic, since, despite his beauty, Absalom killed his half-brother and rebelled against his father. Thus, Green concludes the following regarding Hartmann's use of this comparison:

> [Absalom] could come to be regarded as a typical rebel. This figure was therefore a Janus-like topos and could be fittingly employed in ambiguous situations whenever an author wished to suggest negative features behind positive ones or to indicate that certain virtues are irrelevant if they are not backed up by other qualities.[22]

With respect to all four figures, with whom Erec is being compared, Green reveals that

> These four figures all share this one feature: they were all enslaved by love and by a woman.[23]

While I agree with Green's conclusion that, through this comparison, Hartmann alludes to Erec's subsequent verligen, I cannot accept his contention that

> Behind this praise, behind this comparison with such worthy figures there lurks Erec's failure, still invisible to us, but soon to be revealed [my emphasis]. This passage prepares the way by its

---

[22] Green 799-800.

[23] Green 801.

use of irony.[24]

Admittedly, we have, at this point no way of predicting Erec's verligen. But, from our analysis of the work thus far, we can certainly predict that Erec will fail in some way, since he has continued to do so throughout the course of Hartmann's Erec. The point to be made here is that Erec's forthcoming failure is not so "invisible" as Green suggests.

B. Life Outside Arthur's Court

Erec and Enite now depart for Karnant, where Erec's father, King Lac, rules. King Lac promptly and conveniently abdicates, thus making Erec and Enite, king and queen. At this point, they dispense with all activities (except for mass and dinner), other than lovemaking. As a result, Erec ignores his knightly (and all other) responsibilities, which results in discord at court and in Erec's loss of face in the community:

> Erec wente sînen lîp
> grôzes gemaches durch sîn wîp.
> die minnete er sô sêre
> daz er aller êre
> durch si einen verphlac,
> unz daz er sich sô gar verlac
> daz niemen dehein ahte
> ûf in gehaben mahte.
> des begunde mit rehte
> ritter und knehte. (Erec 2966-76)

Erec, of course, remains oblivious to the disparity between his former life and his present one. Indeed, he also does not seem to be aware of his loss of social status.

Gossiping soon spreads throughout the court until, finally, it comes to the attention of Enite who blames herself (Erec 3001-12). Erec, in turn, learns of the gossip, when Enite, believing that he is asleep, blurts out her concern. Erec's reaction is immediate: he and Enite leave the court (he, in full armour concealed beneath his outer garb, and she, in her best dress) under the guise of going for a

---

[24] Green 802.

ride. Before they do, however, he orders Enite to ride ahead and not to speak on pain of death (Erec 3093-3102).

Analyzing this verligen scene alone and out of context could lead to the mistaken conclusion that the blame for Erec's verligen lies solely with Enite. And, indeed, many critics have done just that. Frey, for example, states that:

> Für Enite freilich bedeutet dies zunächst eine Zeit unendlichen Leids, mit dem der Mann sie straft für den Genuß, den er mit ihr hatte.[25]

Whereas Frey seems to portray Enite as a seductress and Erec as a seemingly unwilling victim, McConeghy views Enite somewhat differently. He adopts a sociolinguistic approach and finds Enite guilty not of voicing her concerns to Erec, but of not doing so sooner when she first hears rumours.[26] In this connection, he states:

> Enite does seem to have made a serious linguistic mistake, albeit unintentionally, and Erec's decision to punish her and reestablish his authority seems an appropriate response to her face-threatening crime [!][27]

Other critics tend to adopt a middle-of-the-road approach and blame both Erec and Enite. One such critic is de Boor, who believes that:

> Dieser Ausritt wird als eine auf die Welt bezogene Bußfahrt dargestellt. Damit verdeutlicht sich aber

---

[25] Winfried Frey, Walter Raitz, and Dieter Seitz, Einführung in die deutsche Literatur des 12. bis 16. Jahrhunderts, vol. 1 (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1979) 131.

[26] Patrick M. McConeghy, "Women's Speech and Silence in Hartmann von Aue's Erec," Publications of the Modern Language Association of America 102 (1987): 780-81.

[27] McConeghy 775. Cf. Kathryn Smits, "Enite als christliche Ehefrau," Interpretation und Edition deutscher Texte des Mittelalters. Festschrift für John Asher, eds. Kathryn Smits et al. (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1981) 24. Smits believes that Enite, as a woman, is closer to nature and, thus, has the duty to serve as her husband's eyes and ears.

> zugleich, daß auch Enite in die Schuld verstrickt ist, indem sie sich der erzieherischen, zu tätigem Ritterleben spornenden Aufgabe der frouwe nicht bewußt war und sich ihr auch dann entzogen hatte, als sie die Bedrohung von Ereks Ehre erkannt hatte.[28]

Our analysis of Erec leads, however, to the conclusion that Erec is alone to blame for his verligen. We have seen how Erec's single-minded pursuit of Iders in order to obtain revenge led to a breach of courtly etiquette (i.e. Enite's attire), and how Erec's single-minded pursuit of glory and social recognition at the tournament led to reckless behaviour, which could have cost him his life. It comes as no surprise, then, that Erec treats the institution of marriage with the same single-mindedness and recklessness, with which he treated the institution of knighthood.[29] For Erec, marriage appears to be equated with sexual gratification, which he pursues as vigorously as he did his knightly endeavours. Unfortunately for Erec, he does so to the detriment of his knightly activities, thinking that he can rest on his laurels as a knight. He, thereby, reveals his own misconception of what it means to be a knight. A knight must constantly prove himself in battle, since present successes are more important than past glories.

For anyone to expect Enite to shoulder or share the

---

[28] Helmut de Boor, Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang 1170-1250 (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953) 71. Cf. Peter Wapnewski, Hartmann von Aue, 7th edition (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1979) 58-59.

[29] Cf. See 44-45, who similarly observes: "Erec treats his marital duty with the same fervour and enthusiasm he applied to tourneying, and the inadequacies of this behaviour are obvious. He also appears not to have the slightest idea that there is any dissatisfaction with his behaviour. The crisis in Karnant is brought on by Erec's habit of concentrating on one and only one thing at a time, and going about this with such singularity of purpose that he disregards everything else."

blame for Erec's verligen is to ignore the fact that her actions have been determined by Erec's actions. She has not been expected to be independent and initiate actions on her own; thus, it is naive to assume that she should or would do so now. A later text passage in which Erec chastizes Enite for speaking when forbidden to do so, makes it clear that his present actions (i.e. making Enite remain silent) are intended to punish Enite for not telling him about the gossip at court (cf. Erec 3249-58). In this way, Erec reveals a similar sort of naivete about Enite's role in their marriage, in addition to revealing that he is unaware of his own shortcomings both as a knight and as a husband.

Erec's present situation is perhaps best summed up by Meng, who observes that

> Die nun folgende Krise könnte vielleicht damit erklärt werden, daß Erec im ersten Anlauf eine Höhe erreicht hat, der er innerlich nicht gewachsen ist. Aus dem Jüngling wurde ein Ritter, Ehemann und König, ohne daß Erec Zeit gefunden hätte, sich über die Aufgaben, die mit einer solchen Position verbunden sind, Rechenschaft abzulegen. In der Spielwelt des Artushofes hatte dies weiter keine Konsequenzen, in Karnant jedoch wird die Diskrepanz von Schein und Sein, Vermögen und Anforderung sichtbar.[30]

It is apparent, then, that the court in Karnant has expectations of Erec, which are based upon his present social status, yet Erec is socially immature and, thus, unable to meet these expectations. In the Arthurian world, he would be

---

[30] Meng 27-28. Meng sees Erec's verligen as representative of original sin. Cf. Silvia Ranawake, "Erec's verligen and the Sin of Sloth," Hartmann von Aue. Changing Perspectives: London Hartmann Symposium 1985, eds. Timothy McFarland and Silvia Ranawake. (Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1988) 95, 98-99, 102. Ranawake notes that Erec's failing is not his excessive sexual pleasures, but rather, his soft living (98-99). Cf. Lewis 152. Lewis views Erec's verligen as "just one more example of his general immoderation." N.B. All three critics view Erec as bearing sole responsibility for his verligen.

able to cope, but in the world beyond its borders, he is essentially a social misfit.

1. Battle with the Bandits

With nightfall approaching, Enite sees three bandits in the distance. What follows for her is a long and painful struggle with her conscience (Erec 2157-64). After much deliberation, Enite decides that she would rather die than lose so noble a man as Erec, and, thus, she warns him of the impending danger (Erec 3182-88). Erec quickly kills all three bandits. His task is made easier by the fact that all three bandits are only partially clad in armour (Erec 3226-30).

These bandits are reminiscent of Erec when we first met him. They have only meagre armour; Erec had, at first, none, and then acquired meagre armour from Koralus. They wish to obtain fame and fortune by robbing Erec; Erec, in turn, did obtain fame and fortune by "robbing" (i.e. wearing his second-hand armour, he takes the sparrowhawk away from Iders who fully expected to encounter no opposition) Iders of the sparrowhawk. And, lastly, their leader desires Enite and sees her only as a desireable object; and, so too, did and still does Erec. In this way, the bandits are a reflection of Erec himself, and, by defeating them, he gradually begins to exorcise himself of the negative character traits which they embody.

As noted, the process is gradual, and Erec is, at this point, unfortunately still very much the same. Instead of thanking Enite for warning him, he chastizes her for having spoken (Erec 3249-58). He tells her that what a woman would never do when it is not forbidden her, she will do once it is forbidden her. What did Enite not do? She did not warn Erec soon enough of the gossip at Karnant. In addition, she was never forbidden to speak to him. What is she now forbidden? She is now forbidden to speak on pain of death. And, lastly, what does she now do? She does what she is presently forbidden to do--she speaks. His rather sarcastic comments

suggest, then, what has already been stated: he is punishing Enite for not having told him about the gossip at court regarding his verligen.

As if this were not enough, he now punishes her for having spoken to warn him of the bandits! Although he does not kill her, as he had threatened to earlier, he does make her look after the horses that he has captured from the bandits (Erec 3271-74). Interestingly enough, Erec, who is in a sense himself a "bandit," now reduces Enite back to her former status as a stableboy. In this way, Hartmann makes clear that, despite their outer appearance, they have inwardly changed little since they first met. Erec (and through him, Enite) must now learn to become inwardly what he appears to be outwardly, a king and an Arthurian knight (and Enite, a queen).

Erec and Enite next encounter five more bandits. The situation unfolds much the same as before: Enite spots them; wrestles with her conscience; and then tells Erec, who quickly kills them. She is again spared being killed and must continue to look after the horses, this time with eight horses instead of three.

One item of interest is that these five bandits attempt to legitimize their actions by citing Erec's mistreatment of Enite. Their leader states that:

man sol si im nemen, daz ist reht. (Erec 3331)

In addition, another of the bandits has designs on Erec's armour (Erec 3338-40). Despite Hartmann's apparent condemnation of the latter bandit's intention (Erec 3343-46), it is noteworthy that these five bandits should be critical of Erec's mistreatment of Enite. Perhaps it is because he is so much like them. He is a knight in appearance only, and his actions reveal him to be undeserving of a woman such as Enite.

2. Battle with Galoein

Erec's poor treatment of Enite continues to be a

recurring theme. Erec and Enite encounter a young squire, who shares with them his food and drink. In return, Erec gives him one of the eight horses, which he had captured from the bandits. The grateful squire then offers to lead the horses in place of Enite, but Erec refuses his offer (Erec 3590-94).

Somewhat bewildered by Erec's comments, the squire leads Erec and Enite to the castle of his lord, Count Galoein. Although Erec rejects staying at the castle, he does ask Galoein to direct him to the finest guest house in the city.

After their departure, Galoein regrets that he did not steal Enite away from Erec (Erec 3668-71). Despite Hartmann's comment about the negative effects that vrou Minne may have on a man, Galoein, like Erec before him, does not love Enite, but simply lusts after her. This is made evident by the fact that he is, above all, taken by Enite's beauty (Erec 3672-74).

Driven by desire, he takes four knights with him to the guest house in the hope that he will be able to forcibly remove Enite (Erec 3717-22). Erec's insensitive attitude toward Enite serves in this regard to exacerbate the situation.

At the guest house, Erec does not permit Enite to sit at his side at the dinner table. Galoein, quite naturally, immediately inquires about this callous treatment of Enite. Erec's remark that he mistreats her because he feels like it (Erec 3745) leads directly to Galoein's attempt to persuade Enite to leave with him. She, however, continues to display her unswerving loyalty to Erec by rejecting Galoein's proposal:

> swaz ouch mir mîn geselle tuot,
> daz dulde ich mit rehte.
> ze wîbe und ze knehte
> und ze swiu er mich wil hân,
> des bin ich im alles undertân. (Erec 3811-15)

Galoein reacts as expected. He threatens to take her away from Erec, regardless of her wishes.

Enite has only one possible recourse. She tells Galoein that Erec has kidnapped her from her father and that she would only be too glad to leave with him, provided that he were not mocking her. Furthermore, she tells him that she will arrange to steal Erec's sword, so that Galoein will meet with no resistance. Galoein leaves, mistakenly believing that Enite will be his in the morning.

In her bed later that evening (i. e. Erec will also not sleep with her), Enite realizes that her plan will fail if she does not warn Erec. So, after much contemplation, she again breaks the ban of silence. Having been forewarned, Erec immediately prepares to leave with Enite. However, before he does, he gives the proprietor of the guest house the seven remaining horses from the bandits (Erec 4010-15). By doing so, he removes from Enite the burden of having to care for the horses. Surely, if he had wanted to, he could have paid with just four or five horses and kept the remaining ones to continue to punish Enite. But, he does not and, thereby, displays some sympathy, however small, toward Enite.

Meanwhile, Galoein awakens, believing that he has overslept, and immediately heads for the guest house with nineteen of his knights. Obviously, he does not wish to risk being defeated by Erec and thereby risk losing Enite.

Galoein's behaviour at this moment brings to mind that of Erec. Erec had earlier rushed off after Iders without armour, and now Galoein and his men act similarly in that they each, in their haste, bring along only a lance and a shield:

> niuwan schilt unde sper
> hâten si ze wer genomen:
> daz was von ir gaehe komen. (Erec 4107-09)

After Galoein utters a number of threats at Erec, the two begin to fight. This battle, like the previous one, ends rather quickly, however. Galoein receives a lance wound to the side and breaks his arm as Erec knocks him from his mount

(Erec 4205-14). The futile attempts of Galoein's followers to avenge him result in the death of six of them and the flight of the rest of them.

Erec quickly flees himself, fearing that the people in Galoein's land may want revenge. A final point to be made here is that Erec once again berates Enite for having spoken, but this time he no longer threatens her with death (Erec 4258-67) as he did earlier (Erec 4120-32). In this way, Hartmann alludes to the inevitability of a future reconciliation between the two.

3. First Battle With Guivreiz

Erec's next opponent is interesting in that his physical appearance is that of a dwarf, an uncourtly creature, and yet, he is said to have extremely long arms and legs, which are certainly uncharacteristic features for a dwarf (Erec 4282-88). With this unusual description of Guivreiz, 3Hartmann emphasizes the fact that Erec is still a long way from being a perfect knight. As we said earlier, Erec's opponents are a reflection of himself. In defeating the bandits, he also overcame negative character traits in himself, which are embodied by the bandits. Now, he is about to face an opponent, whose dual nature reflects Erec's dual nature. Guivreiz appears to be half dwarf (and, thus, uncourtly/unchivalrous) and half normal-sized knight (and, thus courtly/chivalrous). And Erec is similar in that he has been developing from being unchivalrous in nature (or dwarf-like) to being an ideal knight (or normal-sized). While Guivreiz' condition is permanent, Erec's is not. Erec's growth as a knight is only temporarily stunted.

That Erec's condition is only temporary is evidenced by Guivreiz' reaction to him. Guivreiz immediately recognizes

Erec's worth by the fact that he has a beautiful wife, Enite,[31] and that he has exceptional weaponry (Erec 4331-40).

Erec's change is not solely external, however. He is changing internally as well. The Erec we saw fight Iders and take part in the tournament was an unrestrained Erec, one who would fight at a moment's notice. The Erec presented here is, in contrast, more in control of his actions. He hesitates in fighting Guivreiz until a confrontation is unavoidable:

> als Erec dô gesach
> daz im ze vehtenne geschah,
> sîn ros er wider kêrte,
> als sîn ellen lêrte. (Erec 4378-81)

Erec's hesitancy surprises Guivreiz, who mistakes it for cowardice:

> der herre gedâhte: 'er ist verzaget,
> sît er sîne arbeit klaget.'(Erec 4366-67)

It is not cowardice, however, that explains Erec's reluctance to fight, but rather, in addition to exhaustion, his realization that fighting without good cause benefits no one.

It must also be noted that Guivreiz, though not a member of the Round Table, adopts an attitude that is in accordance with the views of the Arthurian court: one rides out in search of âventiure and does battle with any knight encountered. Hartmann reveals, then, through Erec, that such

---

[31] Cf. Kathryn Smits, "Die Schönheit der Frau in Hartmanns 'Erec'," Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 101 (1982): 18. She notes that Guivreiz is the first of Erec's opponents, who does not have designs on Enite, but sees her beauty for what it is: a reflection of Erec's knightly virtue and prowess. While her ideas are valid, we must note that Guivreiz encounters a far different Erec from the one encountered by the bandits and Galoein. Evidence of this is the fact that Erec no longer burdens Enite with caring for the horses.

a view of knighthood is not totally acceptable to him.[32] In this way, Hartmann alludes to the fact that his hero, Erec, will eventually transcend Arthurian knighthood.

The battle itself is long and arduous and, in many ways, resembles Erec's battle with Iders. Both battles are described at length by Hartmann, which indicates the importance Hartmann places on both battles, which, in the case of the Guivreiz battle, is reinforced by the fact that the previous battles (i.e. bandits and Galoein) were considerably shorter in length and in description.

We are told of lances breaking (Erec 4388-89) and of horses that are exhausted from the force of the jousting (Erec 4390-95). The fight then continues as the two men fence on foot. In marked contrast to the Iders battle, Erec simply defends himself from Guivreiz' sword blows without returning them:

> Erec fil de roi Lac
> vorhte laster und den tôt.
> den schilt er im dar bôt
> und begunde sich mit listen
> âne slege vristen. (Erec 4407-11)

In addition, we are told that Erec fears death and shame. In light of the fact that both knights are evenly matched at this point, Erec's fear certainly seems misplaced. As stated earlier, Erec's thoughts and actions are those of a man who realizes that there is no glory to be gained from such a contest. This is quite a change from the Iders battle, where Erec's energetic fighting was geared toward revenge and the honour, that would come from it.

Erec's half-hearted attempt at fighting results in his being wounded for the first time ever in his knightly career:

---

[32] Meng 34. Meng says of Guivreiz the following: "Er steht damit bestimmt weit über den Raubrittern und dem Grafen, als ein vorbildlicher Ritter im Hartmannschen Sinn darf aber auch er noch nicht gelten. Ein solcher würde nicht um des Ruhmes willen kämpfen, sondern seine Kräfte für andere einsetzen."

> ûf der heide dô schiet,
> zuo der sîten ern erriet
> und sluoc im eine wunden. (Erec 4416-18)

The seriousness of his wound makes his death a real possibility. Luckily for Erec, his reluctance to fight is finally overcome by what, for the first time, appears to be his love and concern for Enite:

> vil lûte schrê diu guote:
> 'ouwê, lieber herre mîn,
> solde ich ez vür iuch sîn!
> jâ waene ich iuch verlorn hân.'
> 'vrouwe, iuch triuget iuwer wân'
> sprach der unverzagete man:
> 'wan dâ verlür ich mêre an. (Erec 4425-31)

Fighting more for Enite's sake than for his own, Erec returns Guivreiz' blows until Guivreiz himself is injured (Erec 4433-38). Although Erec is about to slay Guivreiz, he immediately spares his life upon hearing his plea for mercy. In contrast to the Iders battle, Erec does not extract a promise from Guivreiz. His offer to be Erec's vassal is immediately rejected (Erec 4468-73, 4478).[33] In this respect, Frey notes that Erec responds as he does because Guivreiz is a king and, thus, equal in status to him.[34] It should be remembered as well, however, that Erec's response has as much to do with his internal change, as it does with Guivreiz' status.

Erec is now a different knight than he was before his first battle with the bandits. Meng has pointed out that the series of battles that begins with the bandits and ends with Guivreiz, prepares Erec for his next adventure (an act of compassion) by allowing him to defeat opponents who represent motifs (i.e. Beutegier/eagerness to plunder, Neid/envy, and Ehrsucht/overambitiousness) which do not reflect the

---

[33] Note that, as we said during the discussion of Erec's altercation with the dwarf, the defeated knight in a battle is the first to reveal his name.

[34] Frey 132.

behaviour of an exemplary knight.[35] Despite the fact that Meng speaks of motifs, whereas we speak of negative characteristics, it is evident that both approaches are quite similar and lead to similar conclusions.

A brief episode follows the Guivreiz battle, in which Keii, King Arthur's ill-mannered steward, encounters Erec and Enite. Noticing Erec's wound, Keii attempts to entice Erec to Arthur's camp, so that he can claim to have defeated and captured him. The attempt proves unsuccessful, however. A brief altercation follows, in which Erec first reacts violently, but then shows considerable restraint by using the blunt end of his lance to knock Keii--who has no armour--from his mount.

Keii's disgaceful return to Arthur's camp sparks interest in seeing Erec. So, Gawan and Keii are sent out to invite him to the camp, and, though, he refuses, they manage to trick him into going there.

Erec justifies his refusal to go to Arthur's camp by declaring that he has decided to do without any comfort (Erec 4977-78). Strangely enough, though, he did not refuse a similar offer made by Guivreiz. In light of this, his unwillingness to see King Arthur indicates that he has not yet reached the level of perfection as a knight, that he is seeking. As well, this level of perfection is probably not synonymous with Arthurian knighthood (cf. Erec 5051-61).

Lastly, as Erec leaves the Arthurian enclave, Hartmann

---

[35] Meng 35. Cf. Gert Kaiser, Textauslegung und gesellschaftliche Selbstdeutung. Die Artusromane Hartmanns von Aue, 2nd newly rev. ed. (Wiesbaden: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, Athenaion, 1978) 98. Cf. Sieverding 46, who, in contrast to Meng and Kaiser, believes the Guivreiz confrontation to have the function of determining whether Erec and Enite are capable of reattaining the status they had before Erec's verligen. He says they are not, since Erec refuses to fight at first. Sieverding's view appears to presuppose that Erec was a perfect knight before his verligen. Our analysis suggests otherwise.

mentions Erec's desire to seek <u>âventiure</u> (<u>Erec</u> 5288-92). Erec's initial refusal to fight Guivreiz, who also sought <u>âventiure</u>, indicates that the <u>âventiure</u>, which Erec seeks (both then and now), differs from the type sought by the Arthurian court.[36]

4. <u>Battle with Giants</u>

Erec and Enite come across a frantic woman, whose husband, Cadoc, has been kidnapped by two giants. Without any hesitation whatsoever, Erec offers his services (<u>Erec</u> 5368-71) and rides off in pursuit of the giants.

With Cadoc stripped naked and his hands and feet bound, the two giants mercilessly whip him as he rides ahead of them. Hartmann's comments illustrate just how heinous the giants' actions are:

> si brâchen vaste ritters reht
> und handelten den guoten kneht,
> und waere er begangen,
> an diebes stat gevangen,
> solher zuht waere ze vil. (<u>Erec</u> 5412-16)

The situation is deplorable, but not surprising. The medieval view was that giants were considered to be unchivalrous/uncourtly creatures, and, thus, the actions of these two giants are in keeping with their status. Furthermore, we are told that they wear no armour and carry no lance or shield (<u>Erec</u> 5380-90). Instead, they carry heavy clubs (i.e. unchivalrous weapons).(Thus, it is clear that they are not knights).

As in the battle with the bandits, Erec is faced with foes who are not knights. But, in contrast to that battle, Erec shows remarkable restraint, as he tries to convince the giants to release their prisoner. Though well-intentioned, his attempts lead only to Cadoc's being subjected to more physical abuse from the giants.

With no alternative left to him, Erec charges one of the

---

[36] Cf, Frey 132.

giants, first robbing him of an eye and, then, killing him outright (Erec 5509-16). The second giant puts up more of a fight and swings wildly at Erec with his club until Erec chops off his leg and, then, his head (Erec 5551-52, 5566-69).

While Erec's actions may seem unchivalrous at first glance, they are not. As Grundmann points out, giants (and even robbers) do not belong to courtly society and, thus, they, and, by extension, the knight who fights them, are not bound by its rules of knightly conduct.[37] Hartmann's reference to the "courtly God's" sanction of such behaviour (Erec 5515-17) supports this contention.

Aside from its brutality, the battle is unique in that, for the first time, Erec fights not for revenge or for self-preservation, but for the life of another knight. His altruistic act marks the beginning of a new phase in his knightly career, of which Wapnewski observes:

> Mit dem Cadoc-Abenteuer . . . setzt der zweite Kursus ein: wieder Sieg über rohe Gewalt, aber diesmal nicht in eigener Sache, sondern zum Schutze der Gequälten und Wehrlosen: in dem Maße als der Läuterungsweg sich dem Ende nähert, steigert sich auch der sittliche Wert der Abenteuer.[38]

The act is altruistic in the truest sense of the word, for not only is Erec prepared to sacrifice his life for another, he is in fact almost mortally wounded.

5. Battle with Count Oringles

Overcome by the breaking open of his wounds (which are

---

[37] Karl Grundmann, Studien zur Speerkampfschilderung im Mittelhochdeutschen. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des höfischen Stil- und Lebensgefühls (Warsaw: Josef Piludski University, 1939) 82. Cf. George T. Gillespie, "Real and Ideal Images of Knightly Endeavour and Love in the Works of Hartmann von Aue," Hartmann von Aue. Changing Perspectives: London Hartmann Symposium 1985, eds. Timothy McFarland and Silvia Ranawake (Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1988) 257.

[38] Wapnewski 56. Cf. Frey 133.

actually a result of the Guivreiz battle) and the resulting loss of blood, Erec loses consciousness and collapses. Believing him to be dead, Enite bemoans her loss to the point of attempting suicide. As she attempts to kill herself with Erec's sword, Count Oringles happens along and prevents her from doing so.

As Galoein before him, Count Oringles is taken by Enite's beauty. In fact, he is so attracted to her that he wants to marry her that evening despite her protestations. Enite, however, remains true to Erec. She remains at his side and is inconsolable.

Count Oringles is perplexed by her behaviour. For him, the substitution of him for Erec is as natural as the changing of the seasons. At the height of his insensitivity, he remarks that

> iu ist ein arm man tôt:
> des sît ir ergetzet mit mir.
> den selben wehsel möhtet ir
> immer gerne trîben.
> ich rietez allen wîben,
> wan ez enmöhte in niht gewerren
> daz si einen rîchen herren
> naemen vür einen solhen man.
> iuwer tumpheit ich iu verban.
> nû ezzet durch den willen mîn. (Erec 6497-6506)

When Enite does not comply with his request, he becomes furious and proceeds to beat her (Erec 6515-24). He continues to beat her, much to the dismay of his court, until Erec regains consciousness and hears Enite's screams. Grabbing a sword that is hanging on the wall, he immediately rushes to her aid. Like an avenging angel, he kills Count Oringles with one blow:

> er hâte zornes genuoc.
> des êrsten rûsches er sluoc
> den wirte selbe dritten
> (under den saz er enmitten):
> die andern gâben die vluht. (Erec 6620-24)

Although this altercation with Count Oringles does not really constitute a battle, it is no less important than the

other battles that have thus far been examined. Erec appears to die and then appears to be resurrected. Although he does not actually die (and, thus, is not actually resurrected), the symbolic value of his "death" and "resurrection" cannot be discounted. In this connection, Meng makes the following observation:

> Erecs Tod und Auferstehung sind von tiefer symbolischer Bedeutung. Der unbedingte Einsatz für den Nächsten führte zu Erecs Scheintod, der eine Rückkehr zum absoluten Anfang bezeichnet, von dem aus ein völliger Neubeginn möglich ist. Der Tod hat hier die Bedeutung einer Initiation, einer Übergangsstufe zu einer höheren, reineren Existenz . . .[39]

Erec's "resurrection" does signify a new beginning for him. This is made evident by the fact that he fights to protect Enite and is immediately reconciled with her (Erec 6771-77).[40] But, at the same time, we cannot speak of a total break with the past, since we have seen that Erec has gradually been progressing towards the stage, at which we now find him. To believe that Erec's past is no longer relevant is to deny his development as a knight. Thus, rather than view Erec's resurrection as a fresh new start, it would be more appropriate to view it as a crystalization process, in which his positive qualities have been permanently retained, and his few remaining negative qualities await disposal.

6. Second Battle with Guivreiz

Guivreiz learns of the death of Count Oringles, surmises that Erec is responsible (and in possible danger from Oringles' people), and rides out to aid him. Erec and Guivreiz meet along the same path and, in a typical medieval motif, the two friends do not recognize one another and

---

[39] Meng 40. Meng also mentions the Christ symbolism inherent in Erec's "resurrection" and, thus, refers to Erec as an Erlöser. Cf. Wapnewski 56.

[40] Meng, 41.

proceed to do battle.

Erec is, of course, still suffering from the wounds Guivreiz inflicted on him in their first battle and is thus in a weakened state. So, it comes as no surprise when Guivreiz dismounts Erec on their first joust (Erec 6921-23). The result is that Erec suffers his first defeat ever. In addition, only Enite's intervention spares him possible death at the hands of a friend.

Despite Guivreiz' willingness to blame himself for what has happened, Erec humbly accepts full responsibility. Erec's admission of guilt represents a pivotal point in Hartmann's Erec, since it is the first time that Erec admits that his actions in battle were foolhardy:

> sît daz ich tumber man
> ie von tumpheit muot gewan
> sô grôzer unmâze
> daz ich vremder strâze
> eine wolde walten
> unde vor behalten
> sô manegem guoten knehte,
> dô tâtet ir mir rehte.
> mîn buoze wart ze kleine,
> dô ich alters eine
> iuwer aller êre wolde hân:
> ich solde baz ze buoze stân. (Erec 7012-23)

This realization reveals that Erec has truly come full circle as a knight since his battle with Iders.

Erec's defeat itself has sparked a fair amount of interest in the secondary literature, resulting in a polarization of opinion. The first view, as espoused by critics such as Wapnewski, holds that Erec's defeat serves to emphasize the unmâze present in all of his battles since he left Karnant:

> [Die Niederlage] demonstriert, daß auch in Ereks Aventiuren-weg unmâze war, Hingabe an das Extrem, notwendige Einseitigkeit vielleicht - als Gegengewicht zur maßlosen Liebe -, aber doch

Einseitigkeit.[41]

Such a view ignores, however, the underlying motivation for each of the battles fought since Erec's and Enite's departure from Karnant. The respective battles with the bandits, Galoein, and Guivreiz (first battle) were, for all intents and purposes, acts of self-preservation. The battles with the giants and with Count Oringles were, in contrast, acts of compassion (for Cadoc and Enite respectively). Thus, only the second battle against Guivreiz stands out as an example of Erec's fighting for the wrong reasons.

The second view of Erec's defeat takes the differences between these battles into account. Meng, for instance, rejects the notion that Erec's defeat is indicative of his recognition that his previous battles were the result of immoderation:

> Und wenn sich Erec nach dem Kampf der unmâze bezichtigt, so bezieht sich das nicht auf die ganze Abenteuerfahrt, sondern nur auf den unglücklichen Zufall, daß er den Freund angegriffen hat.[42]

The question of what this battle and accompanying defeat illustrate is answered by de Boor, who states

> . . . Erek muß lernen in Ehren zu unterliegen. Und er muß die Einsicht gewinnen, daß Rittertat ohne tieferen Sinn und sittliche Aufgabe Torheit ist.[43]

---

[41] Wapnewski 57. Note that Wapnewski believes that Erec "kämpft aus bloßer Streitlust und besteht auf der Auseinandersetzung, obwohl er zu Tode ermattet ist." Cf. Petrus W. Tax, "Studien zum Symbolischen in Hartmanns Erec. Erecs ritterliche Erhöhung," Wirkendes Wort 13 (1963): 279.

[42] Meng 43.

[43] de Boor 72. Cf. Sieverding 51, 58. He rejects the view that Erec fights for others in the (second episode triad of the) second part of the romance rather than for himself as he did in the first part. He believes that Erec fights in the second part for "seine Gemeinschaft mit Enite." Therefore, Erec's fault in the second Guivreiz encounter is that he

Thus, de Boor reiterates what has already been said with respect to Erec's first battle with Guivreiz. The reluctance that Erec then showed to fight Guivreiz proved to be correct. A battle fought for the wrong reasons brings no one honour. What Erec sensed then is emphasized now in his defeat by Guivreiz.

C. Joie de la curt/Battle with Mabonagrin

After his wounds have healed, Erec (in the company of Enite and Guivreiz), sets out to ride to King Arthur's court. After some time, the trio comes to a fork in the road:

> welh ze Britanje in daz lant
> gienge, daz was in unerkant.
> die rehten strâze si vermiten:
> die baz gebûwen si riten. (Erec 7814-17)

Instead of taking the road that would lead them to King Arthur's court, they take the "better" road. In this way, Hartmann alludes to the fact that Erec will not simply return to Arthur's court to continue where he left off. Instead, he chooses the better path, the one leading away from the Arthurian court and to an important adventure.

Erec arrives at a castle named Brandigan (located above a park which is enclosed by clouds) where a knight named Mabonagrin resides with his amie. As it turns out, Mabonagrin does battle with all knights, who are foolish enough to seek âventiure (Erec 8474-81). It must be remembered, however, that Erec has nothing in common with such knights, since (as was mentioned in the discussion of the first Guivreiz battle) the âventiure, which he seeks, is not the same as that which they sought.

The âventiure which Erec seeks is not to be found in an endless series of meaningless encounters, where knights fight

---

starts a fight "der nicht im Interesse Enites liegt und der auch nicht dem Schutz der Ehe dient." While he is correct in faulting Erec for fighting Guivreiz the second time, he fails to take into account that Erec's battle with the giants is fought to aid Cadoc and not Enite.

for the sake of fighting. Such an <u>âventiure</u> would have appealed to the old Erec, but the new Erec realizes that no honour can be gained from it. Instead, he seeks one specific battle, in which he can gain everlasting honour and glory:

> dô sprach der künec Erec:
> 'ich weste wol, der Saelden wec
> gienge in der werlde eteswâ,
> rehte enweste ich aber wâ,
> wan daz ich in suochende reit
> in grôzer ungewisheit,
> unz daz ich nû vunden hân.'(<u>Erec</u> 8520-26)

But Erec does not fight for honour alone. He also fights for the widows of the eighty knights who came before him. Although Erec never mentions this as his motivation, Hartmann makes it clear that Erec is deeply touched by the widows' pain and sorrow. He observes that

> Erecke sô gar sîn herze,
> sît in der lîp was gestalt
> sô gar in vreuden gewalt,
> daz ir jugent und ir leben
> sô gar den sorgen was ergeben,
> wan in durch ir triuwe
> der jâmer was als niuwe
> als dô si sîn begunden. (<u>Erec</u> 8335-42)

By fighting on their behalf, Erec can attain the highest possible glory; that which comes from fighting for others.

The events leading up to Erec's battle with Mabonagrin are of special interest, since they provide interesting parallels and contrasts to those leading up to the battle with Iders. A young, impetuous Erec fought Iders for the sake of revenge, whereas an older, more reserved Erec fights Mabonagrin not for revenge but for honour (<u>Erec</u> 8560-62). The young Erec had a loveless relationship with Enite, whom he needed in order to be permitted to fight Iders, whereas the older Erec loves Enite and gains strength from her love (<u>Erec</u> 8860-73), but fights in solitude.

Despite these contrasts, there are a number of parallels between the two battles. Both involve battling a previously undefeated opponent. In the Iders battle, it was for

recognition of Enite's beauty, whereas in the Mabonagrin battle, it is for eternal honour for Erec (Erec 8803-06). From this, it is clear that this contest--like the one with Iders--involves the winning of a prize.

Erec enters the park where Mabonagrin and his lady reside. He spots Mabonagrin's amie and is immediately struck by her beauty. Hartmann tells us of her that

> hie under er gesitzen sach
> ein wîp, als im sîn herze jach,
> daz er bî sînen zîten
> âne vrouwen Enîten
> nie dehein schoener hete gesehen. (Erec 8926-30)

At the same time, however, Hartmann tells us that her beauty is surpassed by that of Enite. Thus, on this basis alone, we have good reason to believe that Erec will be victorious.[44]

As in the Iders battle, there is an exchange of words between Erec and his opponent. This time, however, it is not Erec who is unchivalrous, but Mabonagrin. An indication of Mabonagrin's unchivalrous nature is given by Hartmann, who describes Mabonagrin as follows:

> des boumgarten herre
> was lanc unde grôz,
> vil nâch risen genôz. (Erec 9011-13)

By comparing Mabonagrin to a giant (i.e. an unchivalrous/uncourtly creature), Hartmann immediately alerts his audience to Mabonagrin's true nature and, at the same

---

[44] Cf. Kathryn Smits, "Die Schönheit der Frau in Hartmanns 'Erec'," Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 101 (1982): 24-25. She states, however, that this alone does not ensure Erec's victory, since Mabonagrin's amie is present at the battle, whereas Enite is not. Cf. Hugo Kuhn, " 'Erec'." Hartmann von Aue,. eds. Hugo Kuhn and Christoph Cormeau (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973) 25. Kuhn, in noting the similarity of this battle to the Iders battle, refers to it as a "Wettkampf über die Schönheit ihrer Damen."

time, makes clear which knight he favours.[45]

The battle itself is characterized by great ferocity on the part of both men. The first joust, for example, results in both mens' shields being pierced by the other's lance (Erec 9091-95). The next joust is equally fierce; so much so, in fact, that both Erec and Mabonagrin are dazed and their horses incapacitated (Erec 9118-26). At this point, Hartmann pleads with God to come to Erec's aid (Erec 9129-30). In this way, he makes it clear that his allegiance lies with Erec who is now fighting for the right reason: erbermde.

The two men continue fighting on foot and, as before, their blows are of such magnitude that their shields are whittled down to just their frames (Erec 9140-45). They continue to exchange mighty blows, with only their armour to protect them.

This confrontation reaches its climax when Mabonagrin strikes Erec's helmet, thereby rendering him momentarily unconscious. All that saves Erec from death is the fact that Mabonagrin shatters his sword in the process. In similar fashion, Erec too shatters his sword. It is important to note that Erec's resolve is strengthened not by thoughts of revenge--as was the case in the Iders battle--but by thoughts of Enite:

> der gedanc an sîn schoene wîp
> der kreftigete im den lîp. (Erec 9230-31)

The battle comes to a quite unceremonious end as Erec thwarts Mabonagrin's unchivalrous attempt to slam him into the ground by slipping away and knocking Mabonagrin to the ground. Mabonagrin, however, refuses to surrender until he knows who Erec is. Erec is somewhat bewildered at this

---

[45] Cf. Tax 282. Tax believes that Erec fights for God and justice since his "resurrection." Thus, this battle represents to him the eternal battle between good and evil. He points out that Mabonagrin wears red armour and that red is a colour associated with the devil.

request, but, nevertheless, grants it (Erec 9330-37). Erec then asks Mabonagrin why he and his amie have secluded themselves from the rest of courtly society. Erec's comment that a knight cannot spend all of his time with a woman (Erec 9417-24) serves to illustrate that he realizes that he is to blame for his verligen at Karnant.

The question must be asked, however, whether Erec's verligen is identical to Mabonagrin's problem. Erec spent all of his time engaging in sexual delights with Enite. Mabonagrin, on the other hand, promised never to leave his wife's side unless he were defeated by another knight. In Erec's case, we have shown that Erec alone was to blame for his verligen, whereas in Mabongrin's case, he is bound by a promise made to his wife. Since a knight's word is his bond, the fault lies here solely with Mabonagrin's amie.

Despite these obvious differences between the two situations, a number of critics have sought to view Mabonagrin's situation as identical with Erec's. The implication of this is that Mabonagrin is viewed as a reflection of Erec. Salmon may serve as one example,

> His conduct is an extreme example of triuwe, but Mabonagrin's main significance is as an embodiment of all that Erec has ceased to be; Erec's victory is a victory over himself. Devotion to a woman was the undoing of both of them, even if devotion took a different form in the two instances.[46]

While not wishing to totally dismiss such a widely-held view, it should be obvious, however, that it tends to ignore Erec's development as a knight since having left Karnant. It also fosters the view that Erec's interim battles serve only as "time-killers" until his battle with Mabonagrin.

---

[46] Salmon 61. Cf. Petra Giloy-Hirtz, "Der imaginierte Hof," Höfische Literatur, Hofgesellschaft, Höfische Lebensformen um 1200. Kolloquium am Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung der Universität Bielefeld, 3.-5. Nov. 1983,. eds. Gert Kaiser and Jan-Dirk Müller. (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1986) 257.

One view, that not only takes into account Erec's development as a knight, but also the many parallels and contrasts between this battle and the Iders battle, is put forth by Ranawake:

> Far from resembling Erec and Enite, Mabonagrin and his lady differ considerably from the hero and heroine as portrayed during the Karnant period. In fact structurally and thematically the couple in the enchanted garden are not the equivalent of Erec and Enite in Karnant, but correspond to Erec's first opponent Iders and his lady-friend.[47]

Seen from this perspective, it is clear that Iders and his amie did not appear to belong to any court in particular, but were outsiders as are Mabonagrin and his amie.[48] Whereas Erec represented the Arthurian court and was unchivalrous in his battle against Iders he now represents a higher form of knighthood and is chivalrous when fighting Mabonagrin. In this way, the Mabonagrin battle is simply a thinly veiled re-creation of the Iders battle. It serves to illustrate that Erec now represents Hartmann's ideal of knighthood.

Further evidence of this is the praise that Erec now receives:

> got hât dich uns ze troste gegeben
> und in daz lant gewîset.
> wis gevreuwet und geprîset,
> aller ritter êre! (Erec 9671-74)

It is clear that this praise lacks the irony associated with the praise that Erec received earlier after the tournament.[49] Erec is not simply being praised for his knightly prowess, but rather, for what that knightly prowess

---

[47] Ranawake 110. She notes as well that both Mabonagrin and Iders have love as a stimulus to perform deeds of arms, whereas love prevented Erec from performing deeds of arms.

[48] Cf. Meng 46-47. He views Mabonagrin's minne as "gesellschaftsfeindlich."

[49] Cf. Green 803.

accomplished: the restoration of Joie de la curt.

Erec arranges for Christian burial of the heads of the eighty slain knights. In addition, he consoles their widows and returns with them to the Arthurian court. There, he is once again praised for his actions (Erec 9896-98). But, compared to his previous sojourns at the Arthurian court, he is now praised not simply for having sought âventiure, but for having sought the proper âventiure. His âventiure, as compared to that sought by the Arthurian community, did not simply bring him glory, but also helped others. This, again, illustrates Hartmann's implicit rejection of Arthurian knighthood.

Lastly, Erec does not remain at the Arthurian court, but returns home to Karnant. Although the death of his father, King Lac, provides the impetus for leaving the Arthurian world, our analysis has hopefully shown that King Arthur's court would, in any case, not have been Erec's final destination.[50]

D. Summary

It is the development of the protagonist in Hartmann's Erec which provides insight into the poet's conception of knighthood. Initially, Erec is an imperfect Arthurian knight whose primary motivation appears to be revenge and reestablishing his lost honour. His imperfection as a knight reaches its pinnacle with the verligen episode (in which the hero neglects his knightly duties) that prompts him to leave

---

[50] Cf. W. T. H. Jackson, The Anatomy of Love. The Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971) 23. He notes that the romances of Chrétien (Hartmann's source) treated the Arthurian values ironically. They are "a base from which [the hero] can move to higher things." It would not be surprising, then, to have the Arthurian ideals treated similarly by Hartmann. Cf. Horst Peter Pütz, "Artus-Kritik in Hartmanns 'Iwein'," Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift (1972): 193. Cf. de Boor 95. N.B. Both Pütz and de Boor believe Erec's final destination to be the Arthurian court.

the court in Karnant.

Subsequent to his departure, Erec, in the company of Enite, engages in a series of battles during which he defeats opponents, who represent negative characteristics. By defeating these opponents, Erec, in turn, also symbolically exorcises himself of these negative characteristics. Finally, Erec begins to act out of a sense of compassion in his final few battles.

It may be concluded, then, that Hartmann espouses a type of knighthood in which the knight does battle on compassionate grounds rather than acting out of a sense of revenge and honour. As well, Hartmann's promotion of this type of knighthood suggests an implicit criticism of Arthurian knighthood, namely, that it does not appear to be based upon compassion. In addition, Hartmann also appears to reject the Arthurian concept of <u>âventiure</u> which requires the knight to engage in a series of meaningless encounters, where knights fight for the sake of fighting. In its place, Hartmann seems to favour a concept of <u>âventiure</u> which would allow the knight to fight one battle on purely compassionate grounds.[51]

---

[51] See <u>First Battle with Guivreiz</u> and <u>Joie de la curt/Battle with Mabonagrin</u> sections for a more detailed discussion.

III. HARTMANN VON AUE'S Iwein

Literary criticism concerning Hartmann's Iwein has tended to view it as the counterpart to Hartmann's earlier work, Erec. Whereas Erec had neglected his duties as a knight (and as a king) by spending all of his time with his wife, Enite, Iwein neglects his duties as a husband and king by spending all of his time participating in tournaments. In both works, the protagonist's problem is viewed by many critics as being related to lack of moderation.

Using moderation as a focal point does, however, have its limitations. As Meng has observed, such an approach is too narrow in scope and thus fails to explain the meaning of events such as the adventure at the spring and the dragon battle which do not appear to be connected to the conflict between minne/love and êre/honour. He states further that such an approach leads "zu eher tristen Ergebnissen."[1]

This chapter, then, will investigate the various battles and related text passages in Hartmann's Iwein. The protagonist's development as a knight will be traced in order to ascertain how the changes that he undergoes affect his status as an Arthurian knight and his relationship to the Arthurian court.

A. Early Knighthood

At the beginning of Iwein, Hartmann pays tribute to and extols the virtues of King Arthur:

> Er hât bî sînen zîten
> gelebet alsô schône
> daz er der êren krône
> do truoc und noch sîn name treit.
> Des habent die wârheit
> sîne lantliute:
> sî jehent er lebe noch hiute:
> er hât den lop erworben,
> ist im der lîp erstorben,
> sô lebet doch iemer sîn name.

---

[1] A. Meng, Vom Sinn des ritterlichen Abenteuers bei Hartmann von Aue (Zürich: Juris Verlag, 1967) 21-22.

Er ist lasterlîcher schame
iemer vil gar erwert,
der noch nâch sînem site vert [my emphasis].[2]

It soon becomes apparent, however, that there is some irony in Hartmann's words. While Arthur's court is alive with activity (Iwein 63-73), King Arthur and Queen Ginover depart for their private quarters and fall asleep. Although Hartmann is quick to note that their departure was motivated more by the desire to be alone than to sleep (Iwein 77-85), it is worth noting that he mentions just a few lines earlier that Keii goes to sleep (Iwein 74-76). Keii, whom H. B. Willson describes as "a contrast figure, habitually transgressing the laws of courtly conduct . . . a terrible example, in spite of his comic traits,"[3] is certainly not a character that one would want to be compared to. Yet, Hartmann's juxtaposition of Keii's sleeping scene with that of King Arthur's invites just such a comparison.[4]

The fact that Gawan who, according to Bindschedler, "verkörpert im 'richtigen' Artus-Roman das Maß, nach dem sich die verschiedenen Eigentümlichkeiten der einzelnen Ritter und ihre Nähe oder Entfernung zur Artusgesellschaft abschätzen

---

[2] Hartmann von Aue, Iwein, ed. and trans. Patrick M. McConeghy (New York: Garland, 1984) lines 8-20. All subsequent references to this work will appear in the text of the paper as Iwein with line numbers.

[3] H. B. Willson, "The Role of Keii in Hartmann's Iwein," Medium Aevum 30 (1961): 154.

[4] Cf. Karin R. Gürttler, 'Künec Artus der guote.' Das Artusbild der höfischen Epik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts (Bonn: Bouvier Verlag Herbert Grundmann, 1976) 62. Gürttler believes that Arthur's nap is not indicative of a decay of the Arthurian values nor of criticism of the Arthurian court, since Hartmann has deliberately reformulated the scene to eliminate any possible criticism of Arthur. While her point is well-taken, we would suggest that the scene is not entirely devoid of criticism of Arthur.

lassen"[5] is inspecting the weaponry (Iwein 73) while both Keii and King Arthur sleep, suggests that King Arthur, like Keii, is being viewed with some irony by Hartmann.

Shortly after this scene, a knight named Kalogrenant begins to relate to the other Arthurian knights the story of what happened ten years ago when he rode off in search of âventiure. His ride takes him through dense wilderness (Iwein 265-72) which to a medieval audience would represent the untamed and uncourtly world. He soon leaves the wilderness and rides onto a meadow which signifies his return to the courtly world. It soon becomes clear, however, that this courtly world is not synonymous with the Arthurian world. Kalogrenant approaches a castle where he is greeted by a man who appears to be a knight (i.e. He has a goshawk on his arm which in medieval times was symbolic of knighthood--Iwein 281-85). Kalogrenant is treated well by the lord of the castle and by a young maiden who is also present. But when Kalogrenant mentions that he is seeking âventiure, the lord of the castle appears perplexed:

> des wundert in vil sêre,
> und jach daz im nie mêre
> dehein der gast waere komen
> von dem er haete vernomen
> daz er âventiure suochte,
> und bat daz ich des geruochte,
> swenn ich den wec dâ wider rite,
> daz ich in danne niht vermite. (Iwein 373-80)

Since all Arthurian knights seek âventiure, we may conclude that, prior to Kalogrenant's arrival, no Arthurian knight had ever ventured near this castle. Thus it stands outside the influence of the Arthurian court and its conventions.

After leaving the castle, Kalogrenant rides back into the wilderness (i.e. the uncourtly world) where he encounters a variety of wild animals which appear to be doing battle

---

[5] Maria Bindschedler, "Die Dichtung um König Artus und seine Ritter," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 31 (1957): 94.

(Iwein 400-11). Among them he notices a strange and wild-looking Waldmensch. According to the description given of him in the text, he resembles a wild animal more than he does a man (Iwein 424-70). His appearance along with his presence in the wilderness (i.e. the uncourtly world) and the fact that he carries a club (rather than a sword or a lance) indicate his uncourtly and non-knightly status.

Kalogrenant's fear of him is soon dispelled, however, when the two begin to talk. From their conversation it becomes clear that the Waldmensch's nature is at odds with his seemingly frightening appearance. When Kalogrenant asks him whether he is good or evil (Iwein 483), he responds as follows:

> Er sprach 'swer mir niene tuot,
> der sol ouch mich ze vriunde hân.' (Iwein: 484-85)

His response reveals a very simple logic: Whoever wishes him no harm is unconditionally accepted as a friend and, conversely, whoever wishes him ill will is an enemy. It is apparent, then, that, despite his wild and untamed appearance, the Waldmensch is actually quite gentle and restrained if not threatened by others.

The conversation reaches its climax when the Waldmensch asks Kalogrenant what he is seeking and whether he could be of any assistance to him. As earlier at the castle, Kalogrenant says that he is seeking âventiure. In contrast to the earlier episode where the lord of the castle had never before met anyone seeking âventiure but appeared to know what it was, the uncourtly Waldmensch is totally unfamiliar with the concept.

Kalogrenant then defines the concept of âventiure in very simple terms:

> 'Daz wil ich dir bescheiden baz.
> Nû sich wie ich gewâfent bin:
> ich heize ein rîter und hân den sin
> daz ich suochende rîte
> einen man der mit mir strîte,
> der gewâfent sî als ich.

Daz prîset in, und sleht er mich:
gesige aber ich im an,
sô hât mich vür einen man,
und wirde werder danne ich sî.' (Iwein 528-36)

This passage has attracted much attention in the secondary literature, since it is generally believed to represent Hartmann's criticism of âventiure as practised by the members of the Arthurian court.[6]

It may, at first glance, be tempting to say that the uncourtly Waldmensch is simply not capable of understanding this courtly concept and leave it at that. Such a view, while not untrue, however, ignores the fact that the Waldmensch's philosophy appears to be more courtly and certainly more humane than that of Kalogrenant. The Waldmensch may respond violently only if he is first threatened by another (i. e. in self-defence). Kalogrenant, on the other hand, may respond violently whenever he encounters another knight (i. e. in self-defence or in an act of aggression) and believes that honour is to be gained from such a possible confrontation. The contrast between these two characters could not be more evident. The Waldmensch adheres to a philosophy which appears quite courtly, whereas Kalogrenant, the supposedly courtly Arthurian knight, adheres to a philosophy which, in comparison to that of the Waldmensch, does not seem courtly. It will become apparent during the course of our examination of Iwein that this scene represents only the first of many times that Hartmann indicates his rejection of the Arthurian court's concept of âventiure.

Despite his bewilderment, the Waldmensch tells Kalogrenant where he may find what he is seeking. A few miles

---

[6] Meng 34. Note that Kalogrenant's definition of âventiure is similar to that put forth by Guivreiz in Hartmann's Erec (Erec 4336-47). Our interpretation of that work suggested Hartmann's rejection of this type of âventiure. Cf. Giloy-Hirtz 259, who states: "Der âventiure-Begriff des Artusritters Kalogrenant kann kaum als vorbildhaft gelten."

away, there is a beautiful fountain above which rests a decorated stone. Kalogrenant must collect water from the fountain and pour it over the stone. Then he must wait for his âventiure (Iwein 550-99). Kalogrenant follows the Waldmensch's instructions, but as soon as he pours water over the stone, the placid surroundings change. A violent storm erupts, which levels the forest and turns the sky dark. After a short time, however, the forest reappears and so too do the sunny skies and singing birds.

Along with the return of the forest comes a knight who is large and fearsome. The knight known as Ascalon berates Kalogrenant for the damage he has caused and challenges him to a battle. Ascalon's charges seem somewhat extreme, however, since the previous condition of the forest has automatically restored itself. Nevertheless, Ascalon's kingdom did experience a major disruption and he quite rightly feels slighted. He states

> 'Ichn hân wider iuwern hulden
> mit mînem wizzen niht getân
> âne schulde ich grôzen schaden hân.
> Hien sol niht vrides mêre wesen:
> wert iuch, ob ir welt genesen.' (Iwein 726-30)

At this point Kalogrenant, who appears to have forgotten his own âventiure definition, does not immediately do battle with Ascalon as one would expect, but, instead, tries to convince him of his innocence because, as he tells his fellow Arthurian knights, wan er was merre danne ich (Iwein 733). Within the framework of his own âventiure definition, his actions must be regarded as those of a coward, since he now seeks to avoid that which he earlier claimed to seek--knightly battle. In addition, his claim of innocence must be viewed with some skepticism. Although he did not know exactly what would happen when he poured water onto the stone, he was told by the Waldmensch that doing so would result in his obtaining âventiure. Thus he received exactly what he had sought: the opportunity to fight another knight. And, lastly,

even if he were innocent, his âventiure definition makes no provision for the alleged innocence of one or even both knights who encounter one another. They simply fight for the sake of fighting.

Despite his attempts to avoid it, Kalogrenant now does battle with Ascalon. After only one joust, he finds himself on the ground and his horse being led away by Ascalon. Ascalon, in contrast to an Arthurian knight, does not demand Kalogrenant's name or extract a promise from him.[7] He simply ignores him, much as one would a bothersome gnat once one had taken a swipe at it (Iwein 749-56).

Kalogrenant has been humiliated on a number of levels. Firstly, he has been quite handily defeated. Secondly, he has lost his horse. And, lastly, he also loses his armour, since he must discard it in order to be able to walk home (Iwein 773-78). The end result is that he is temporarily stripped of his identity as a knight, since he now lacks the basic requirements of knighthood: honour, armour, and a horse. This is what his âventiure definition has gotten him.

1. Battle With Ascalon

After having heard Kalogrenant's story, Iwein immediately offers to redress the wrong done to him:

> er sprach 'neve Kâlogrenant,
> ez richet von rehte mîn hant
> swaz dir lasters ist geschehen.
> Ich wil ouch varn den brunnen sehen,
> und waz wunders dâ sî.' (Iwein 805-09)

This comment leads, of course, to a remark by Keii who

---

[7] Hubertus Fischer, Ehre, Hof und Abenteuer in Hartmanns "Iwein." Vorarbeiten zu einer historischen Poetik des höfischen Epos (Munich: Fink, 1983) 33. Fischer notes: "Während Askalon die volle Anerkennung durch den Sieg zuteil wurde, läßt er auch nicht den Schimmer eines Widerscheins von dieser Ehre auf Kalogrenant zurückfallen. Er verhält sich vollkommen unritterlich." While Fischer's comments are true, he fails to mention that Kalogrenant's own behaviour is also far from being exemplary.

typically functions as a mocker of others.[8] After a brief exchange of words between Iwein and Keii and then Queen Ginover's rebuke of the latter, King Arthur finally awakens and is informed of Kalogrenant's story (Iwein 810-92).

Apparently the Arthurian court knows no statute of limitations in matters such as that of Kalogrenant, for King Arthur immediately announces his intention to ride to the fountain in fourteen days time (Iwein 893-903). The whole point seems moot, however, since Kalogrenant has presumably engaged in knightly combat (and regained his lost honour?) since his defeat at the hands of Ascalon. It has, after all, been ten years. In addition, it is doubtful whether Ascalon would even have any recollection of the encounter, since such battles appear to be so routine for him that he does not even bother to look at the knights whom he defeats (Iwein 749-55).

It is at this point that Iwein worries that he may be denied the opportunity to do battle with Ascalon, since Gawan, the paragon of Arthurian knighthood, would probably be granted the first joust against Ascalon (Iwein 907-18). His desire to gain knightly honour is so strong that he steals away from the Arthurian court, so that he will arrive at the fountain ahead of King Arthur and the other knights. In this connection, Kraft observes

> Was Iwein eigentlich bewog, vorzeitig zum Brunnen zu reiten, war weniger die Absicht, dem Sippengedanken zu genügen und Kalogreants Ehre zu rächen, wie er vor versammelter Runde vorgab (805ff.) als vielmehr etwas für seinen eigenen Ruhm zu tun.[9]

---

[8] Bindschedler 96. She observes: "Die Person des Spötters ist notwendig, um die Mitglieder der Gesellschaft immer von neuem zu prüfen, aber auch, um sie nach außen hin zu schützen und in ihrer Einheitlichkeit zu bewahren."

[9] Karl-Friedrich O. Kraft, Iweins triuwe. Zu Ethos und Form der Aventiurenfolge in Hartmanns 'Iwein.' Eine Interpretation (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1979) 107. He notes as well that Iwein's actions represent superbia (108). Cf.

While the pursuit of honour is a knight's prerogative, doing so in contravention of King Arthur's wishes is certainly not the most chivalrous thing to do.

Iwein retraces the path taken by Kalogrenant ten years earlier and arrives at the fountain. Once there, he pours water on the stone and unleashes the same series of events that Kalogrenant had. In contrast to Kalogrenant's battle, however, Iwein's battle with Ascalon proceeds in accordance with Kalogrenant's âventiure definition. Hartmann tells us

> Ir ietweder was gereit
> ûf des anderen schaden:
> sî hete beide überladen
> grôz ernest unde zorn
> Sî nâmen diu ors mit den sporn:
> sus was in zuo ein ander ger. (Iwein 1008-13)

Iwein does not try to proclaim his innocence as had Kalogrenant, since he probably learned from his example. But, as Hartmann makes clear, Iwein has come to fight. He is not intimidated by Ascalon, as was Kalogrenant, and jousts with equal ferocity. Each knight runs his lance through the other's shield, thereby shattering it in the process. The battle continues at a feverish pace with Iwein and Ascalon

---

Dieter Welz, "The Spirit of Adventure in MHG. Romances of the Arthurian Cycle. Hartmann von Aue and Gottfried von Straßburg," English Studies in Africa 16 (1973): 84. Welz claims that Iwein's rush to fight Ascalon is exemplary, since Hartmann as narrator appears to reject slothfulness in Iwein (7171-72). It is quite clear, however, that Iwein's motivation to get to Ascalon first has little to do with a desire to avoid being slothful. Cf. Fischer 24. Fischer, who (9) distinguishes between "vornehme Moral" (morals of the medieval nobility) and "Moral der modernen Idee" (modern morality), notes: "Für Schuld im Sinne irgendeiner Verfehlung ist hier kein Platz. Dieser Vorwurf müßte dann auch Artus und alle Ritter seiner Runde treffen." He fails to mention, however, that while Iwein's concept of honour is Arthurian, he races to the fountain in defiance of Arthur's wishes, whereas the rest of the Arthurian court does not.

fencing until both men's shields are whittled down to nothing (Iwein 1014-28). The battle takes a decisive turn when Iwein delivers a blow which pierces Ascalon's helmet. The fatal blow results in a dying and somewhat disoriented Ascalon fleeing in the direction of his castle:

> dô twanc in des tôdes leit
> mêre dan sîn zageheit
> daz er kêrte und gap die vluht.
> Her Iwein jaget in âne zuht
> engegen sîner burc dan [my emphasis].
> (Iwein 1053-57)

Fearing that Ascalon may get away and that he will then be unable to prove that the battle actually took place (Iwein 1062-71), Iwein sets off in pursuit. As Ascalon passes through the first portcullis at the front of his castle, Iwein delivers a final blow from behind (Iwein 1105-06). As he does so, the portcullis closes, resulting in Iwein's being trapped between it and the second one. All that saves Iwein from death is the fact that he had been leaning forward as he struck Ascalon. His horse is not so lucky: it is sheared in half (Iwein 1105-18).

A considerable portion of the secondary literature concerning Iwein has been devoted to the analysis of this battle scene. Two issues have attracted the most attention: Hartmann's âne zuht comment (Iwein 1056) and, in connection with this, Iwein's pursuit and subsequent killing of Ascalon. With respect to the first issue, opinion is divided between those critics who view Hartmann's comment as his moral condemnation of Iwein and those who view it as a simple commentary on the speed with which Iwein pursues Ascalon.

One critic belonging to the first group is Frey who believes the comment to be a direct reference to Iwein's lack of self-control:

> Als [Ascalon] nach seiner Burg flieht, verfolgt ihn Iwein, alle Regeln des ritterlichen Comments verachtend âne zuht - ohne sich zu beherrschen,

wie es dem vollendeten Ritter ansteht.[10]

In contrast, Fischer, who belongs to the second group, believes <u>âne zuht</u> contains no moral overtones and simply describes the pursuit:

> Es muß nicht mehr besagen, als daß der Verfolger, Weg und Richtung nicht achtend, oder einfach ungestüm dem Fliehenden nachsetzt. Damit wäre dann aber auch kein vernichtendes moralisches Urteil über den 'Täter' gesprochen, sondern nur der Charakter des 'jagen' selbst beschrieben.[11]

Although it is clear that both views are possible, it seems most likely that Hartmann's comment refers simply to the

---

[10] Frey 140-141. Cf. Welz 85, who acknowledges Hartmann's disapproval of Iwein's actions, but does not attach great importance to them. He views Hartmann's comment as "a random remark, soon forgotten and of no further significance." Cf. Peter Wapnewski, <u>Hartmann von Aue</u>, 7th ed. (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1979) 78. He says of Hartmann: "er sieht ihn [Iwein] vom Gesichtspunkt des Moralisten her und sagt das schwer wiegende Wort: <u>her Iwein jagt in âne zuht</u> (v. 1056), den schwer Getroffenen, den zur Flucht nicht seine Feigheit zwang, sondern des <u>tôdes leit</u> (v. 1053)."

[11] Fischer 29. He notes as well that if Iwein had given up the chase, he would have lost honour and thus his standing as a person. Cf. Paul Salmon, " 'âne zuht'; Hartmann von Aue's Criticism of Iwein," <u>Modern Language Review</u> 69 (1974): 557. He observes that "action [Iwein's final blow] and comment [<u>âne zuht</u>] are separated by some fifty lines, and . . . the expression <u>âne zuht</u> is applied to the pursuit itself, while the modern commentator takes offence at Iwein's lunging at a dying man from behind. The first is, of course, a precondition of the second, but they may be regarded as two incidents separated by the passage of time." Cf. Volker Mertens, " 'Iwein' und 'Gwigalois' - der Weg zur Landesherrschaft," <u>GRM</u> (1981): 29. He states the following with respect to Hartmann's <u>âne zuht</u> comment: "Dem <u>âne zuht</u> entspricht hier das Anspornen des Pferdes . . . - da <u>zuht</u> auch "ziehen" heißen kann, könnte hier "ohne das Pferd am Zügel zu ziehen" gemeint sein. Solange die Reiterterminologie nicht besser bekannt ist, sollte diese Möglichkeit nicht ausgeschlossen werden." Cf. Karl Heinz Borck, " Über Ehre, Artuskritik und Dankbarkeit in Hartmanns Iwein," <u>Die Ehre als literarisches Motiv. E. W. Herd zum 65. Geburtstag</u>, ed. August Obermayer (Dunedin, N. Z.: Department of German, University of Otago, 1988) 5.

pursuit and not to the pursuer. Admittedly, this comment appears before the actual killing of Ascalon and thus should not be viewed in the same light. It must be stated, however, that though Hartmann does not appear to have criticized Iwein's behaviour at this point, it must nevertheless be viewed as unchivalrous. No honour can, in our opinion, be gained by pursuing a seriously wounded opponent who is quite likely to die anyway.

With respect to the second issue, opinion appears divided between those critics who excuse the killing and see it as quite normal, and those who condemn it. One critic belonging to the first group is Fischer who takes Hartmann's comments (that Iwein required proof of his victory) at face value and believes that Iwein's concern justifies his actions. He observes

> Kann er also keinen konkreten Siegesbeweis erbringen, dann hilft es ihm auch nichts, die höfische Regel zu durchbrechen und nun doch von seiner Tat zu berichten: man wird es ihm nicht glauben.[12]

---

[12] Fischer 31. Cf. Fischer 34. Fischer notes that on the basis of 13th century law "die tiefe Ehrverletzung [fällt] auch rechtlich stärker ins Gewicht als die durch "nôt" veranlaßte Tötung." While we will not take issue with Fischer's claims with respect to medieval law, it should be noted that law and morality are not always synonymous. Cf. Fischer 47. He states that Hartmann refers to the killing as a "Totschlag ('erslagen') . . . niemals als 'mort'." While it is true that this incident cannot be labelled a murder, it also cannot be labelled a chivalrous act. What is important is not that Ascalon was killed in battle, but how he was killed. Cf. Sieverding 92, who believes that Iwein is not guilty in the eyes of the Arthurian court. What he fails to mention is that if this battle is supposed to be a typical Arthurian battle, then it certainly casts a negative light on the institution of Arthurian knighthood. Cf. Cormeau 204, who claims that Iwein was forced to kill Ascalon, since he might have returned to do further harm to Iwein. A close reading of the text suggests, however, that Ascalon was already on the brink of death as he fled and would probably not have returned to resume the battle. Cf. Salmon 558, 561. He believes that "Iwein's lunge from behind is based in some way

Fischer, however, fails to take into account that not all battles have witnesses. Kalogrenant's battle with Ascalon had no witnesses, yet no one at the Arthurian court required proof that he had fought a battle. The fact that he had no horse and no armour was considered proof enough that he had been in a battle and had not been victorious. Iwein's battle with Ascalon also has no witnesses but the fact that he has no shield or lance in addition to possession of a bloodied sword (i.e. from striking through Ascalon's helmet to his head) and his own horse (i.e. a defeated knight would have no horse since the victor usually takes it as his prize) would most assuredly have been accepted at the Arthurian court as proof that he had been victorious in battle even if Iwein himself did not think so. In Hartmann's Erec, for instance, there are many occasions on which Erec either kills another knight or wounds him, but does not require him to appear at the Arthurian court (i.e. an example of the former would be his battle with Oringles and of the latter his battle with Galoein). Although Enite witnesses these battles (as do some surviving followers of the two opponents--they, however, want to kill Erec, not spread his fame), a cynic at the Arthurian court might well have suggested that Erec made the whole thing up and that Enite's corroboration of his story was a lie. No one, however, does, since a knight's word is his bond. If he claims to have defeated a certain opponent, then his account is accepted without hesitation. To suggest otherwise would result, for instance, in absurd situations where a knight, after killing an opponent in a knightly contest, would be required to return to the court with his body as proof of victory. This would be a gruesome

---

on Yvain's [in Chrétien's Yvain] attempt to drag Esclados from the saddle . . . " Regardless of the events in Chrétien's work, Hartmann's work clearly tells us that Iwein struck Ascalon from behind. No attempt to grab him is ever mentioned or suggested!

proposition at best.

The second group of critics believes that the act of striking a dying knight from behind is unchivalrous. Wapnewski serves as one example,

> Ja, Iwein führt noch einen zweiten Schlag gegen ihn (den Chrestien nicht kennt), weil er nämlich Sorge hat, man werde ihn mangels Zeugen seine Tat nicht glauben, wenn er den Gegner nicht erschlage oder fange (v.1062-1074). Das ist praktisch gedacht; aber ritterlich und rechtlich ist es nicht.[13]

We must agree that Iwein's actions betray a lack of chivalry on his part. This lack of chivalry, however, is already evident back at the Arthurian court where Iwein's all-consuming need for honour and social recognition led him to ignore King Arthur's decree and race to the fountain on his own. In accordance with Kalogrenant's <u>âventiure</u> definition, he does battle with Ascalon to the point where the gaining of honour appears to take precedence over fighting chivalrously. In this connection, Borck remarks

> Es ist kaum zu übersehen, daß Kalogrenants Definition, sein eigener Kampf gegen Ascalon und Iweins Brunnenaventiure völlig deckungsgleich sind. Der Sinn solcher <u>âventiure</u> erschöpft sich in kriegerischer Selbstbestätigung und in einem Ehrgewinn, der selbst die Tötung eines Mitmenschen zu rechtfertigen vermag, weil er an eine einzige Vorbedingung gebunden ist: daß <u>er gewâfent sî als ich</u>.[14]

It is apparent, then, that this battle illustrates the consequences of adhering to a philosophy which equates the winning of honour with killing another knight simply because he is unfortunate enough to have met up with you. As well, it is obvious that Kalogrenant's <u>âventiure</u> definition is too restrictive in nature; its guidelines are so rigid that they do not permit a knight to use his own judgement in deciding

---

[13] Wapnewski 78.

[14] Borck 5-6.

whether or not to fight a particular battle. It also does not allow him to decide when his actions may have exceeded the boundaries of chivalrous conduct. Lastly, it is evident that the Waldmensch's philosophy, though also rigid and simplistic, is superior to that of Kalogrenant, for it would allow a knight to fight only when threatened by another knight. Thus it would probably not be as likely to lead to such disastrous results as those encountered by Iwein in his battle with Ascalon. Although one may say that Iwein had no choice but to defend himself against Ascalon after having poured water on the stone at the fountain, this would ignore the fact that Iwein's need for honour and recognition (i. e. adherence to Kalogrenant's âventiure definition) led him there in the first place.

2. Marriage to Laudine

Iwein finds himself trapped between the two portcullises of Ascalon's castle with no apparent way out. A short time later, however, a door beside him opens and Lunete, lady-in-waiting to Queen Laudine (wife of Ascalon) appears. Because she recognizes him as the knight who spoke kindly to her on an earlier visit to the Arthurian court, she offers to help him out of his predicament (Iwein 1178-1201). She gives him a magic ring which allows its bearer to appear invisible to all those around him (Iwein 1202-10). With the aid of the ring he is then able to escape detection and avoid being murdered by Ascalon's followers.

In his invisible state he is also able to see his slain opponent's body being carried by and his grieving widow (Iwein 1305-10). In a strange twist of fate, Iwein finds himself falling in love with Laudine:

> dâ was ir hâr und ir lîch
> sô gar dem wunsche gelîch
> daz im der minne
> verkêrten die sinne,
> daz er sîn selbes gar vergaz
> und daz vil kûme versaz
> sô sî sich roufte unde sluoc.

Vil ungerne er ir daz vertruoc:
sô wolder dar gâhen
und ir die hende vâhen,
daz sî sich niht enslüege mê.
Im tete der kumber alsô wê
an dem schoenen wîbe
daz erz an sînem lîbe
gerner haete vertragen. (Iwein 1333-47)

His love for her becomes so strong, in fact, that only Lunete's intervention prevents him from running to Laudine and thereby alerting her followers to his presence (Iwein 1440-92).

Lunete takes pity on him and convinces Laudine that she needs a new husband to protect the fountain, since without one she will lose her honour and kingdom when King Arthur and his men arrive (Iwein 1821-43). In addition, Lunete convinces her that the best man she could find would be her husband's killer:

'Ich erziuges nû genuoc,
der in dâ jagete unde sluoc,
der ist der tiurer gewesen:
mîn herre ist tôt und er genesen.' (Iwein 1967-70)

After convincing herself that Iwein may have acted in self-defence (which is not entirely true), Laudine agrees to meet him. The meeting itself indicates the disparity between the two. Lovestruck Iwein is first at a loss for words as he gazes upon Laudine and then falls to his knees. She, on the other hand, is quite matter-of-fact as she informs him that she needs him to protect her kingdom:

Daz muoz ich ê besorgen
mit einem manne der ez wer:
der ist niender in mînem her,
sît mir der künec ist erslagen:
des muoz ich in vil kurzen tagen
mir einen herren kiesen
ode daz lant verliesen. (Iwein 2314-20)

She proposes marriage, he accepts, she obtains the approval of her advisors, and the two are married.

It is interesting to note that this relationship appears to be similar and also opposite to that between Erec and

Enite in Hartmann's Erec. Erec required Enite in order to gain admittance to the Sperberkampf and fight Iders. He promised to marry her if successful. Laudine needs a protector for her kingdom and obtains one by marrying Iwein. Both Erec and Laudine enter into marriages of convenience rather than ones of love.

3. Battle with Keii

It now arises that Iwein, a somewhat overzealous Arthurian knight, finds himself assuming the role of his dead opponent:

> Des tôten ist vergezzen:
> der lebende hât besezzen
> beidiu sîn êre und sîn lant.
> Daz was vil wol zuo im bewant. (Iwein 2435-38)

In assuming this new responsibility, he commits himself to defending the fountain from all outsiders including King Arthur and his men. Thus, his interests must now come into conflict with those of the Arthurian court.

King Arthur and his men arrive at the fountain exactly fourteen days from the time King Arthur first made his decree. Noting the absence of Iwein, Keii slanders him for not being there. As he had earlier at the Arthurian court, he attributes Iwein's bravado back at the court to too much wine (Iwein 2455-64) and insinuates that once its effects wore off, so too did Iwein's courage. Gawan, of course, immediately defends his friend Iwein by noting that there must be a good reason for his absence (Iwein 2508-20).

It is at this point that King Arthur pours water onto the stone which unleashes the same series of events mentioned earlier, except of course that now Iwein instead of Ascalon rides out to defend the fountain. Interestingly enough, Iwein's appearance is marked by Hartmann's statement that he resembles an angel (Iwein 2551-54). This description of Iwein suggests that Hartmann views Iwein's present motivation to do battle as pure. Earlier, he had fought in accordance with Kalogrenant's âventiure definition. Now, however, he fights

not to gain honour, but to protect his fountain. In other words, he now fights in self-defence in accordance with the Waldmensch's philosophy (cf. Iwein 484-85). Here again, Hartmann's implicit rejection of the Arthurian concept of âventiure is evident.

In addition, Iwein's initial fear that Gawan would be granted the opportunity to joust ahead of him is shown to have been unfounded. Keii requests the first joust and King Arthur grants him his wish (Iwein 2547-50).[15] It is possible, then, that all Iwein had to do was ask for the first joust and he may very well have been granted his wish.

Keii, like Kalogrenant before him, is knocked from his steed on the first joust--much to the delight of the other Arthurian knights. While their delight comes partly from the fact that it is Iwein who has unseated Keii, it must be noted that this battle reflects negatively on the Arthurian court. Iwein, acting as a non-Arthurian knight, has defeated Keii, King Arthur's personal choice and thus the Arthurian court's representative. By defeating Keii, Iwein has shown his superiority over the Arthurian knights.

4. Gawan's Advice to Iwein

King Arthur and his men are invited to rest at Iwein's castle where they spend a total of seven nights celebrating Iwein's good fortune. When they are about to depart for the Arthurian court, Gawan takes Iwein aside and advises him to avoid becoming too comfortable and succumbing to verligen the way Erec did (Iwein 2783-94). In this regard, Gawan suggests

---

[15] Cf. Pütz 194, who wonders how Hartmann's negative description of Keii can be reconciled with the fact that King Arthur considers him to be a noble knight. He asks: "Wirft das nicht zugleich ein negatives Licht auf Artus selbst und die an seinem Hofe geltenden ethischen Prinzipien?" Our analysis thus far suggests that Pütz is correct. King Arthur's sleeping scene revealed him to have much more in common with Keii than with Gawan. His granting Keii the first battle instead of Gawan appears to support our view of King Arthur.

the following solution:

> Daz hûs muoz kosten harte vil:
> swer êre ze rehte haben wil,
> der muoz deste dicker heime sîn:
> sô tuo ouch under wîlen schîn
> ob er noch rîters muot habe,
> unde entuo sich des niht abe
> ern sî der rîterschefte bî
> diu im ze suochenne sî. (Iwein 2851-58)

Gawan's advice to Iwein appears, then, to represent a compromise between the demands of chivalry and those of marriage. William Henry Jackson views it similarly:

> . . . Hartmann is attempting here, with a regard for the unideal commitments of rural noble life that is rare in the poetry of the time, to define a programme that would reconcile the claims of errant chivalry and the duties of lordship.[16]

In accordance with Gawan's advice, Iwein asks Laudine to grant him a wish which she then grants. Much to her dismay, his wish is that he be allowed leave to compete in tournaments (Iwein 2913-21). With some hesitation, she grants him one year's leave with the following proviso:

> Ouch swuor sî des zewâre,
> und beliber iht vürbaz,
> ez waere iemer ir haz.
> Ouch swuor er, des in diu liebe twanc,
> in dûht daz eine jâr ze lanc,
> unde ern sûmde sich nicht mê,
> er kaeme wider, möhter, ê,
> esn latzte in êhhaftiu nôt,
> siechtuom vancnüsse ode der tôt. (Iwein 2926-34)

To seal their agreement, Laudine gives Iwein a golden ring in the hope that it will bring him good fortune. In addition, Hartmann tells us that the two exchanged hearts, thereby implying that Laudine now loves Iwein as much as he loves her (Iwein 2987-94).

---

[16] William Henry Jackson, "The Tournament in the Works of Hartmann von Aue. Motifs, Style, Functions," Hartmann von Aue. Changing Perspectives. London Hartmann Symposium 1985, eds. Timothy McFarland and Silvia Ranawake. (Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1988) 250.

Iwein leaves with King Arthur and his retinue, intent on following Gawan's advice. The two prove inseparable as they enter a variety of tournaments where Gawan's coaching helps Iwein emerge victorious (Iwein 3040-50).

After a year's time has elapsed, Iwein and Gawan return to the Arthurian court from another successful tournament. As they rest, it suddenly occurs to Iwein that he has forgotten about his promise to Laudine (Iwein 3069-87). Shortly thereafter, Lunete arrives, chastizes Iwein and reclaims the ring that Laudine had given him as a symbol of the bond between them and of her love for him (Iwein 3101-3200).

Iwein's breach of promise to Laudine has created a fair amount of interest in the secondary literature. The main focus has been to determine who (or what) is to blame for this breach of promise. Fischer, for instance, blames Iwein, but is quick to point out that he is not morally guilty, only legally responsible:

> Was als Schuld des Helden bleibt, ist allein die Terminversäumnis, und auch diese hat mit Moral nicht das Geringste zu tun.[17]

Giloy-Hirtz, on the other hand, considers the differences between the Arthurian court and Laudine's court to be so overwhelming that Iwein was bound to fail:

> Die Alternative lautet . . . Laudinehof oder Artushof. Unentwegt berühren sich jene beiden Sphären, zwischen denen der Held hin und her gerissen wird. Den einen Hof gewinnen, mit Laudine leben, aber auch die Anerkennung und Atmosphäre des anderen nicht missen: zu unterschiedlich sind sie in ihren Lebensformen, in ihren Ansprüchen und Erwartungen, als daß Iwein ihnen beiden Genüge tun könnte.[18]

And, finally, Frey holds Iwein and the Arthurian court (i. e. primarily through its representative, Gawan) responsible for Iwein's oversight:

---

[17] Fischer 69.

[18] Giloy-Hirtz 260.

> Er hat also zweimal gegen höfische Normen verstoßen - nur das ist zunächst einmal ein scheinbarer Widersinn, er hat gegen diese Normen verstoßen, weil er gerade wiederum höfischen Normen folgte: gegen Askalon hat er gesiegt, weil er kämpfte gemäß Kalogreants Aventiure-Definition, also weil er kämpfte wie ein traditioneller Artusritter. An Laudine wurde er schuldig, weil er sich, verführt durch den "höfischsten" Ritter Gawein, als Artusritter auf der Aventiurenfahrt vergaß. Er verritterte, wie das im Gegensatz zu Ereks verligen genannt wurde. Hierin liegt ganz offensichtlich eine Kritik an Normen ritterlich-höfischen Verhaltens wie es durch das Artus-Rittertum repräsentiert wird. Auch die Gefahren, die dieses Normverhalten mit sich bringt, werden deutlich herausgestellt.[19]

While it is true that Iwein's uncourtly/unchivalrous behaviour[20] (in both the Ascalon battle and in his breach of promise to Laudine) is due in large part to his adherence to the tenets of Arthurian knighthood, it is unfair to suggest that Gawan himself is entirely to blame. Gawan's advice to Iwein represented, as was said earlier, a compromise between Iwein's knighthood and his marriage. He wanted his friend Iwein to maintain a healthy balance between the two. Thus, his advice was sound.

Iwein, however, did not follow his advice to the letter. He engaged in tournaments, but forgot about his duties to his wife as symbolized by his promise to her. In other words, he simply returned to his former lifestyle as a bachelor Arthurian knight and ignored the fact that he had a wife and a kingdom awaiting his return. In addition, Hartmann does not tell us whether Gawan was aware that Iwein had to return in

---

[19] Frey 143. Cf. Borck 7-8.

[20] Hans Naumann, "Ritterliche Standeskultur um 1200." Höfische Kultur. Eds. Hans Naumann and Günther Müller. (Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1929), 14. Naumann notes: "Rücksichtslose Übertreibung des Ritterwesens ist unhöfisch und bestraft sich sehr schwer mit dem Verlust der Minne, der Freude, der Zucht, des Verstandes, wie der 'Iwein' lehrt."

one year's time, only that he suggested Iwein ask Laudine for leave for a certain length of time (Iwein 2886-89). Thus, although Gawan could have asked Iwein what length of leave he had obtained from Laudine and then periodically reminded him of it, it was not his duty to do so.

Although Iwein is usually viewed as the counterpart to Erec, it is apparent that the two men are similar, since they both fail as kings. Each rises quickly from relative obscurity as an Arthurian knight to the celebrated status of king. The quickness with which the change takes place, however, results in a situation where each man's inner nature is incongruous with his present station in life (i.e. outer form). Society expects them to behave as mature kings, yet each man is still an immature and impetuous Arthurian knight. Thus, each man is unable to live up to society's expectations of him and is doomed to fail.

In this regard, Naumann observes,

> Formen müssen erfüllt sein, ehe der Inhalt in Kraft treten kann . . . Laudine zürnt Iwein, weil er den Termin der Heimkehr versäumte, keine ahte ûf sie gewan (8081,88): aus der unerfüllten Form, die sie so symbolisch nimmt, hatte sie auf seine absolute Treulosigkeit geschlossen.[21]

Although a medieval audience may have equated the acquisition of form with that of content, our analysis suggests that Iwein (as well as Erec) lacked the correct content from the very beginning of his kingship, thus the form (i.e. his status as king and husband) could not sustain itself.

B. Life After Disgrace at Arthur's Court

---

[21] Naumann 39-40. Naumann notes that, for a medieval audience, form was equated with content. Thus, once a certain form was attained (i.e. Iwein's kingship), it would have been assumed that the content (i.e. qualities associated with being a king such as emotional maturity) was also present. When Iwein fails to live up to the form he has, it is only then that Laudine (and the medieval audience) realizes that the corresponding content is lacking. His new form then becomes that of a faithless man.

As an Arthurian knight, Iwein finds himself at the pinnacle of success. Even King Arthur praises him for his accomplishments as a knight (Iwein 3075-81).[22] He has, however, failed both as a king and as a husband and is stripped of these two roles when Lunete condemns him at the Arthurian court. In addition, he also loses his identity as a knight, since, as Naumann states, minne service and knighthood go hand in hand with one another.[23]

As a result of his disgrace at court and the accompanying loss of identity, Iwein slips away from the Arthurian court (much as he did earlier when he left in search of âventiure at Ascalon's fountain). It is at this point that Hartmann confirms our earlier comment regarding Gawan's alleged guilt in this matter. Hartmann says of Iwein,

> Er verlôs sîn selbes hulde:
> wan ern mochte die schulde
> ûf niemen anders gesagen:
> in hete sîn selbes swert erslagen. (Iwein 3221-24)

Iwein does, then, come to the realization that he has no one but himself to blame for his present situation.

1. Iwein's Madness

Iwein reaches a field in the vicinity of the Arthurian court, but yet far enough away from it so as not to be noticed. It is there that a change comes over him:

> Dô wart sîn riuwe alsô grôz
> daz im in daz hirne schôz
> ein zorn unde ein tobesucht,
> er brach sîne site und sîne zuht
> und zarte abe sîn gewant,
> daz er wart blôz sam ein hant.
> Sus lief er über gevilde
> nacket nâch der wilde. (Iwein 3231-38)

Iwein goes mad, and Hartmann makes it quite clear that vrou

---

[22] Cf. Wapnewski 74-75, who notes that only Laudine and her emissary, Lunete, criticize Iwein.

[23] Naumann 28-29. He also notes that in Hartmann's works this minne service is dedicated to the knight's partner in "die zur Hohen Minne geadelte höfische Ehe . . . "

Minne is responsible (Iwein 3254-60).[24]

Having determined the cause of Iwein's madness, the question of what purpose it serves must be addressed. In this connection, Keller comments,

> In order to mature and properly assume his new role as Laudine's geselle und herre (v. 2665), in a relationship of mutual love and understanding, Iwein had to first experience a total break with his past, hence his wân. Only in this way can he establish his independence.[25]

Iwein's break with the past begins when his madness causes him to shed his clothing. Wenzel has the following to say concerning this action:

> Im Ablegen der Kleidung realisiert sich eine conversio zum Bestialischen, keine Initiation des homo novus, sondern ihr Gegenbild die Vernichtung des höfischen Menschen, der mit den adligen Kleidern die menschliche Lebensform aufgibt.[26]

---

[24] Cf. Heinz-Günter Schmitz "Iweins zorn und tobesucht. Psychologie und Physiologie in mittelhochdeutscher Literatur," Sandbjerg 85. Dem Andenken von Heinrich Bach gewidmet, eds. Friedhelm Debus und Ernst Dittmer (Neumünster: Wachholtz, 1986) 98. Schmitz views Iwein's tobesucht from the perspective of medieval temperament theory. He comes to the conclusion that Iwein's symptoms are synonymous with the ailment of melancholy (i.e. result of too much black bile) brought on by Iwein's worry and deep sorrow related to his loss of Laudine's minne. Although Schmitz' study reveals that Iwein's condition was a recognized medieval medical ailment, it does little to show what Hartmann's intent was with regard to this passage. Cf. Pütz 196, who observes: "Daß eine solche Wirkung auf ihn möglich ist, beweist seine Andersartigkeit gegenüber den übrigen Artusrittern." Pütz' comment is true enough, but he fails to take into account that Iwein's reaction occurs as a result of a situation with which the other Arthurian knights are not faced.

[25] Thomas L. Keller "Iwein and the lion." Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik 15 (1980): 73.

[26] Horst Wenzel "Ze hove und ze holze - offenlich und tougen. Zur Darstellung und Deutung des Unhöfischen in der höfischen Epik und im Nibelungenlied," Höfische Literatur, Hofgesellschaft, Höfische Lebensformen um 1200. Kolloquium am Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung an der Universität Bielefeld, 3.-5. Nov. 1983, eds. Gert Kaiser and Jan-Dirk

Iwein's shedding of his courtly attire represents his first break with courtly society, since it is this society which places a great deal of emphasis upon clothing (i. e. outer appearance) and Iwein apparently no longer does. In addition, his final break with courtly society occurs as he runs into the wilderness which represents the uncourtly world. In this way, he rejects the courtly world in favour of the uncourtly world.

It is interesting to note that, although Iwein now resides in the uncourtly world, he behaves more humanely than he did before. In the battle with Ascalon, Iwein fought in accordance with Kalogrenant's <u>âventiure</u> definition which led him to pursue honour at any price (i. e. he kills Ascalon in a most unchivalrous fashion). Now, however, Iwein lives much the same as did the <u>Waldmensch</u> whom Kalogrenant encountered earlier. He hunts wild game and lives in peace. Although he encounters a hermit who fears him due to his wild appearance (<u>Iwein</u> 3283-93)--just as Kalogrenant (and later, Iwein) had feared the <u>Waldmensch</u>--it soon becomes clear that Iwein means no harm to anyone. The hermit, fearing that Iwein will attack him, gives him some bread (<u>Iwein</u> 3295-3302). After eating it and drinking some water as well, Iwein leaves. In two days time, however, he returns with some wild game which he has killed and leaves it for the hermit. The hermit eventually becomes less fearful of Iwein (just as Kalogrenant became less fearful of the <u>Waldmensch</u> after having spoken with him), and the two live in harmony exchanging food (<u>Iwein</u> 3331-37). Thus, it can be seen that Iwein has abandoned Kalogrenant's <u>âventiure</u> definition in favour of the <u>Waldmensch</u>'s philosophy in accordance with which Iwein now lives. Paraphrasing the <u>Waldmensch</u>'s explanation of his philosophy (<u>Iwein</u> 484-85), we can say that Iwein currently reacts as follows: <u>swer im niene tuot,/der sol ouch in ze vriunde hân</u>.

Müller (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1986) 284-285.

Iwein's situation does not remain static, however. One day while he is sleeping in the woods, three courtly ladies come upon him and soon recognize him as being Iwein (Iwein 3371-86). A magical ointment is applied some time later to his body by one of the ladies, and Iwein soon begins to recover (Iwein 3475-3504).[27]

Upon awakening, Iwein believes that his life before his madness had all been a dream (Iwein 3505-43, 3565-68). After much contemplation, he makes the following decision:

> Er sprach: 'mich hât gelêret
> mîn troum: des bin ich gêret,
> mac ich ze harnasche komen.
> Der troum hât mir mîn reht benomen: [my emphasis]
> swie gar ich ein gebûre bin,
> ez turnieret al mîn sin. (Iwein 3569-74)

The relegation of Iwein's former life to the status of a dream results in most of his previous knightly accomplishments (with the notable exception of his marriage to Laudine) being reduced to nothing, for when the "dream" ends, so too do the accomplishments. In other words, they become unimportant. Since they were performed in the service of the Arthurian court, then it too, by extension, becomes unimportant. In addition, they led to the loss of his social status, for, at the moment, he is no longer a knight. Thus, acting in accordance with the tenets of the Arthurian court ironically led to a loss of identity as a knight. This latter point is supported by the fact that, although Iwein realizes that he is to blame for having lost Laudine's favour (Iwein 3535-39), King Arthur is also implicitly held accountable. As Iwein recounts his dream, he notes that it was King Arthur who led him away from Laudine (Iwein: 3530-34) and that Gawan was his companion. Since we know that Iwein left Laudine's

---

[27] Cf. Schmitz 103, who mentions that rubbing the body (especially the forehead and temples) with milk, oil, or ointment was a prescribed treatment for the medieval medical condition of melancholy.

court upon Gawan's advice and that King Arthur had no part to play in Iwein's decision to return to the Arthurian court, the inclusion of King Arthur in Iwein's recollection of his "dream" suggests that Hartmann is indicating that Iwein's following of Arthur (both literally and figuratively--by the latter we mean his adherence to the Arthurian lifestyle) resulted in Iwein's loss of Laudine. In this way, Hartmann is critical of Arthurian knighthood.

This does not mean, however, that Iwein rejects knighthood per se, for, though his past as an Arthurian knight is dismissed as having been a dream, he believes that he will again be a knight and that he will gain honour. Mohr views the situation similarly:

> Seine [Hartmanns] Dialektik liegt darin, daß dem Erwachenden sein früheres Leben, das uns doch als "geschehene" Geschichte eben erzählt worden ist, zum Traum wird, der gegenwärtige unmenschliche Zustand zur "Wirklichkeit". Der dialektische Umschwung - und damit die "Heilung" - setzt ein, als sich der "Traum" in "Erinnerung" verwandelt und so zum Appell wird, ein neues ritterliches Leben anzufangen.[28]

Iwein is once again clothed in courtly attire, which is provided by the ladies, and thus reintegrated into courtly society to begin his knightly career anew.[29]

---

[28] Wolfgang Mohr, "Iweins Wahnsinn. Die Aventüre und ihr 'Sinn'," Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum 100 (1971): 84. Cf. Borck 10, who views Iwein's queries (Iwein 3510, 3577) in the context of biblical imagery. He believes these queries represent Iwein's "Einsicht, daß artushaftes Aventiurerittertum Gottferne bedeutet. Zu neuem Leben erwacht, wird Iwein die paulinischen Waffen des Lichts ergreifen, die traditionell auf die christlichen Tugenden gedeutet werden." While Borck shares our view that Iwein abandons Arthurian knighthood and begins his life as a knight anew, he does not clearly explain why Arthurian knighthood should represent "Gottferne."

[29] Cf. Wenzel 285, who believes that Iwein's reintegration into courtly society is as a homo redivivus and not as a homo novus. Our analysis suggests, however, that Iwein returns as the latter. He does not return to resume his

2. Battle With Count Aliers

It seems that the lady responsible for Iwein's reintegration into courtly society, the lady of Narison, has been troubled for some time by Count Aliers, an overzealous and scorned suitor, who continues to wage war on her land.

She now enlists Iwein's help in ridding herself of this threat to her land (Iwein 3408-19). Count Aliers and his men arrive in the lady of Narison's land and she is able to respond by sending Iwein (as leader of a group of the land's knights and squires) out to do battle with them. Iwein's men are initially overwhelmed by the opposing forces, but Iwein's bravery gives them new courage and spurs them on to victory (Iwein 3713-22). Count Aliers' men are driven back and eventually forced to retreat. Most of those who were unable to retreat are killed by Iwein and his men, and the remainder are taken prisoner (Iwein 3744-47).[30]

Count Aliers, who has continued to fight, must eventually retreat and does so by racing to his castle. Iwein intercepts him and accepts his surrender on behalf of the lady of Narison subject to Aliers' agreement that he make restitution to her (Iwein 3775-84).

The similarity between this battle and the previous one with Ascalon has not gone unnoticed in the secondary literature. Keller observes,

> The Ascalon and Aliers battles are strikingly similar in detail. Iwein pursues them both up narrow roads leading to their respective castles and catches up with them at the castle gates. But in the case of Aliers, Iwein does not kill him but

---

life as an Arthurian knight, but rather, returns in search of a type of knighthood that will bring him lasting honour instead of the transitory (i.e. "dreamlike") honour he won as an Arthurian knight.

[30] Cf. Sieverding 119, who remarks: "Aliers' Begleiter würden der Gräfin als Gefangene von keinerlei Nutzen sein, deshalb werden sie auch von Iwein ohne Bedenken niedergemetzelt . . . "

> instead demands an oath of surrender. This time Iwein acted in a manner agreeable to Hartmann's new code of honor.[31]

While I agree that Iwein's behaviour in the Aliers battle appears more chivalrous than that in the Ascalon battle, it must be noted that the latter battle differs from the former in that Iwein is never seriously faced with the prospect of Aliers' escaping from him. He does overtake him (Iwein 3771-75) due to the fact that Aliers' escape route is long and steep, whereas in the Ascalon battle, he found himself directly behind Ascalon, but unable to overtake him. So, while the two battles are similar, they are not identical.

It cannot be denied, however, that Iwein does not kill Aliers, as he could have, but takes him prisoner, instead. The reason for Iwein's display of mercy has correctly been determined by Sieverding who explains,

> Iwein läßt Aliers leben, weil der Zweck dieses Kampfes ein ganz anderer ist als der des nahezu identisch ablaufenden Kampfes gegen Ascalon. Während Iwein gegen den Herrn des Brunnens in erster Linie um seine persönliche "êre" kämpft, entspringt seine Motivation hier als Dankbarkeit gegenüber der Gräfin. Für diese ist Aliers als Gefangener aber viel wertvoller als als Toter . . . .[32]

Iwein, who is no longer operating under the constraints of Kalogrenant's âventiure definition, appears to exercise some judgement in this battle and determine that nothing would be gained by killing Aliers.

Although early critics such as de Boor have tried to suggest that Iwein now begins to fight in aid of others (i.e. erbermde),[33] this suggestion ignores the importance of Iwein's subsequent encounter with the lion which we view as

---

[31] Keller 72.

[32] Sieverding, 118.

[33] de Boor 81.

pivotal to Iwein's further development as a knight.

The majority of contemporary critics, with whom we concur, view Iwein's actions as indicative of his gratitude to the lady of Narison and not of erbermde. One such critic is Borck who concludes,

> Nicht ungezügeltes Ehrstreben bestimmt sein Handeln, sondern jene Dankbarkeit, die er den hilfreichen Frauen schon an der Stätte seines Erwachens zugesagt hat . . . [34]

In addition (as Borck also suggests), a close reading of Hartmann's Iwein reveals that Iwein promises to reward the lady of Narison for her kindness (Iwein 3634-36). As well, Hartmann states during the Aliers confrontation that Iwein repaid her for her favours (Iwein 3723-27). Thus, Hartmann's comments suggest that Iwein's motivation for entering into this battle is his gratitude to the lady of Narison. It is therefore premature to speak of erbermde as a motivating factor in his actions at this point in the text.

With his debt to the lady of Narison repaid, Iwein departs, despite the fact that she wants him to remain as lord of the land (Iwein 3802-11). In this connection, Borck states,

> Anders als ein Artusritter, der ausgezogen ist, in der âventiure sein Glück zu machen, verzichtet Iwein auf die Hand der frouwe von Narison und auf

---

[34] Borck, 10-11.

Cf. Fischer, 105, who notes that Iwein must fight in service of the lady of Narison, if he wishes to resume his knightly career, since it is she who supplies him with a horse and armour.

Cf. A. T. Hatto, " 'Der Aventiure meine' in Hartmanns Iwein." Mediaeval German Studies. Presented to Frederick Norman Professor of German in the University of London by his Students, Colleagues and Friends on the occasion of his retirement. Ed. The Institute of Germanic Studies, London University. (London: Institute of Germanic Studies, London University, 1965), 97.

die Herrschaft über ihr Land.[35]

Iwein's departure serves as further support of our contention that the battle with Count Aliers, though of a different quality than that with Ascalon, did not bring Iwein the type of honour he now seeks (Iwein 3569-71). If it had, he might have been persuaded to stay with the lady of Narison.

C. Iwein - Knight with the Lion

Shortly after his departure, Iwein hears a terrible sound and decides to investigate. In a clearing he finds a dragon and a lion locked in combat.[36] After some hesitation about which animal he should help, Iwein decides to render aid to the lion (Iwein 3846-49). He quickly kills the dragon, and the grateful lion stays with him from that day onward (Iwein 3877-82). Zutt rightly notes that Iwein's battle for the lion marks an important turning point for him:

> Der Drachenkampf im Iwein zeigt nicht nur die Verwirklichung der ritterlichen Wertvorstellungen durch den Helden und ist die erste Bewährungsprobe in einer aventiuren-Kette, in deren Verlauf Iwein immer wieder Personen, die schuldlos in Not geraten sind, unter Einsatz seines Lebens hilft. Er ist auch ein Wendepunkt in Iweins Leben: Durch die Besiegung des Drachen gewinnt Iwein den Löwen als Freund, der späterhin seinerseits Iwein in aussichtslosen Kämpfen zum Sieg verhilft.[37]

---

[35] Borck 10-11. Cf. Fischer 106, who believes that Iwein is seeking honour, not "neue Herrschaft."

[36] Hartmann von Aue, Iwein, ed. and trans. Patrick M. McConeghy (New York: Garland, 1984) 365. McConeghy notes that the Middle High German word wurm "can refer to a worm, a serpent, a snake, dragon, or figuratively to the Devil" but that in Iwein it appears to be "a fire-breathing dragon."

[37] Herta Zutt, "Drachenkämpfe," Bild und Gedanke: Festschrift für Gerhart Baumann zum 60. Geburtstag, ed. Günter Schnitzler (Munich: Fink, 1981) 20. Cf. Pütz 197, who states that Iwein now embarks upon an "Aventiurenweg unter umgekehrten Vorzeichen ,. . . der seine früheren Schwächen als Artusritter nun als überwunden zeigt. Seine Taten sind nicht mehr Aventiuren im Sinne der Definition Kâlogrenants, sondern selbstlose Taten der baermde." Cf. Keller 63, who

Whereas Iwein's previous battles were fought either for honour within the parameters set by Kalogrenant's âventiure definition (i.e. battle with Ascalon) or in gratitude (i.e. battle with Count Aliers), Iwein's intervention on behalf of the lion is the first in a series of battles in which Iwein uses his knightly prowess to aid the oppressed. A close reading of Hartmann's Iwein reveals that the lion was at a definite disadvantage due to the dragon's fire-breathing ability (Iwein 3841-45) and may, therefore, be viewed as the oppressed party in this altercation.

Iwein's decision to come to the aid of the lion (rather than the dragon) has created a great deal of interest among critics who have tried to determine what the lion may symbolize. It is generally believed that the lion symbolizes good. Frey who may serve as one example provides the rationale for this belief:

> Es ist die Symbolinterpretation nicht überstrapaziert, in dem Drachen das Symboltier des Schlechten, Bösen, der Hölle sehen zu wollen und im Löwen das Gegenteil.[38]

All other views on the question of what the lion may

---

argues that by helping the lion, Iwein "has chosen the good side of courtly life which might be described as the positive effects of âventiure as described to the wild herdsman by Kalogrenant . . . . " Cf. Kraft 75, who states that this battle reveals "wie weit Iweins neue Haltung des selbstlosen Einsatzes für das Gute entfernt ist von dem Motiv des selbstsüchtigen "êre"-Gewinns beim ersten Ausritt zum Brunnen."

[38] Frey 144. Cf. Meng 63, who states: "Wir gehen nicht fehl, wenn wir in Hartmanns Roman in Löwe und Drache die elementaren Gegensätze von Gut und Böse sehen und deshalb der Entscheidung Iweins eine große Bedeutung zumessen." Cf. Keller 63, who observes: "In siding with the lion, Iwein, after deliberating, has chosen the good side of courtly life which might be described as the positive effects of âventiure. Thus it might also be argued that in helping the lion Iwein has turned against the purposeless destruction and havoc in general which result from âventiure as described to the wild herdsman by Kalogrenant . . . "

symbolize appear to be variants on this theme. The lion is variously seen as representing iustitia,[39] loyalty,[40] rehtiu triuwe,[41] and, lastly, Christ.[42] Gillespie, who, perhaps, best reflects the confusion created by so many differing views concerning the possible symbolism of the lion, comments that the lion is "clearly symbolic of good," but then goes on to list a number of other possibilities such as justice, humility, gratitude, compassion, fidelity, courage, righteous wrath, Christ, and, lastly, Iwein's alter ego.[43] Finally, Keller adds the possibilities of generosity and knightly perfection, but concludes that a compromise may be the best solution:

> More than likely, Iwein's lion represented a little of all of these for the medieval audience.[44]

While not wishing to refute any of the suggestions made by the various critics, our view of the lion is that he represents Christ. There are two main reasons for maintaining that the lion represents Christ. Firstly, the lion is doing

---

[39] Borck 15.

[40] Gustav Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters, vol. 2, part 2, 1st half. (Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927) 182.

[41] Sieverding 148-149.

[42] Hatto 97, observes: "The lion is Christ: who else would be at grips with the Serpent, the Ancient Enemy?" Hatto seems to contradict himself a short time later, however, when he asserts that Iwein is also Christ (i. e. "the Second Adam"). Obviously Iwein and the lion cannot both be Christ. If Hatto is perhaps alluding to a trinity, he does not make clear who or what would represent the third party of this trinity.

[43] Gillespie 264.

[44] Keller 64. In addition to the possibilities listed by Keller and the other literary critics it is also possibile that the lion could symbolize royalty. However, no critics, to my knowledge, mention this possibility.

battle with a dragon; a creature commonly viewed as symbolizing evil. Secondly, once the lion comes into Iwein's life, his life as a knight changes in much the same way as does a person's life once he/she accepts Christ into his/her life. By rescuing the lion, Iwein sets the course that his new knighthood will take. He will henceforth engage in knightly combat as a champion for the oppressed. In this way, he will gain the type of honour that comes from helping others rather than the transitory honour that is associated with Arthurian knighthood.

Iwein and the lion continue onward until they by chance arrive at the fountain. It is here that Iwein is reminded of and comes to terms with his past. He realizes how much honour he once had and how he was unable to keep it (Iwein 3969-79).[45]

It is at this moment of anguish that Iwein notices Lunete nearby. She relates to Iwein the dilemma in which she now finds herself. After Iwein's disgrace and subsequent disappearance, Lunete found herself accused of being a traitor to both Laudine and her land (Iwein 4048-54), since it was she who suggested that Laudine marry Iwein.

To silence her accuser, an ignoble steward, Lunete responded as follows:

---

[45] Timothy McFarland, "Narrative Structure and the Renewal of the Hero's Identity in Iwein," Hartmann von Aue. Changing Perspectives: London Hartmann Symposium 1985 eds. Timothy McFarland and Silvia Ranawake. (Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1988) 144. McFarland believes that Iwein's monologue represents "a marked shift in Iwein's value-orientation away from the primacy of chivalric prowess in itself, as was appropriate to the Arthurian context of the first cycle [i.e. all action prior to Gawan's advice] which we may perhaps see as a representation of the world of the iuvenes [i.e.bachelor-knights]. This is not to be seen in the least as a shift in his preoccupation from honour to love or to the service of others, but as a change in the orientation of his concept of honour itself." It must be stated, however, that, in contrast to McFarland, we believe Iwein's new concept of honour to be related to his service for others.

> Ich sprach durch mînen zorn,
> swelhe drî die tiursten man
> sich von dem hove naemen an
> daz sîz beredten wider mich,
> einen rîter vund ich
> der mit in allen strite,
> ob man mir vierzec tage bite. (Iwein 4146-52)

The steward immediately responds to her challenge by selecting his two brothers as co-accusers and Lunete is left in the dilemma of having to find a knight to accept her cause.

She immediately thinks of either Gawan or Iwein, but is unable to find either one (Iwein 4169-79) and thus has been cast in a cell to await her execution for treason which is to take place on the following day. Her inability to find Gawan is explained by the fact that Queen Ginover had been kidnapped and Gawan had to ride out to rescue her (Iwein 4288-02).[46] Lunete states further,

> Dô suocht ich den künec Artûs,
> und envant dâ nieman ze hûs
> der sich ez wolde nemen an: [my emphasis]
> sus schiet ich âne kempfen dan. (Iwein 4165-68)

While it is understandable that the queen's abduction would require Gawan's immediate attention (and that the Arthurian court would probably be in a state of confusion because of it), it does not reflect well on the Arthurian court that there was no one willing to take on Lunete's cause. In this connection, it is important to note that Lunete does not state that no one was there, but rather that those Arthurian knights who were at court were unwilling to come to her aid.

The Arthurian court's unwillingness to champion Lunete's cause may be viewed as Hartmann's implicit criticism of Arthurian knighthood in that it contrasts sharply with Iwein's response. He reveals his identity and immediately

---

[46] Cf. Wolfgang Brandt, "Die Entführungsepisode in Hartmanns 'Iwein'," Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 99 (1980): 323.

offers his services (Iwein 4306-14). Although one may argue that he volunteers to champion her cause out of a sense of guilt (since he does admit that he is to blame for the predicament in which she now finds herself--Iwein 4218-28), a close reading of the text reveals another reason.

Earlier in the text, Iwein tells Lunete that her situation is more grave than his (Iwein 4075-79). This comment is made by a man who, a short time earlier, was contemplating suicide because of the grief he felt at remembering his loss of wife and honour (Iwein 3933-42, 3993-4000). For him now to put his own troubles aside in order to help Lunete reveals him to be a compassionate man--certainly more so than the knights at the Arthurian court.[47]

Iwein promises to return the following day and rides off to make preparations for the battle (Iwein 4306-09). His promise to Lunete is reminiscent of his earlier promise to Laudine, for at that time he also promised to return within a specified period of time. In addition, his breach of promise to Laudine resulted in her and her kingdom being left unprotected and open to possible challenges from knights, just as it also resulted in Lunete's being challenged. This time, however, a breach of promise will result in Lunete's death.

1. Battle with the Giant Harpin

Iwein chances upon a castle whose outer courtyards have been burned (Iwein 4360-69). Although Iwein is warmly greeted and treated well, he soon realizes that something is amiss. The people at this court appear happy, but Iwein senses that they are putting on a brave face (Iwein 4398-4421). His suspicions are confirmed when their happiness quickly turns to sorrow (Iwein 4422-31).

Upon inquiring about the problem, Iwein is told by the lord of the castle that he is being harassed by a giant. It

---

[47] Cf. Meng 66.

seems that the giant wanted his daughter's hand in marriage and he refused. In anger the giant stole all of the lord's possessions except for the one castle (Iwein 4463-68). In addition, he has kidnapped the lord's six sons all of whom are knights. He has already hanged two of them and will hang the remaining four on the following morning unless he is given the lord's daughter.

After hearing of the lord's plight (and of the fact that his wife is Gawan's sister), Iwein offers to fight the giant. In comparison to the episode in which he helped the lady of Narison in her dispute with Count Aliers, Iwein offers his services not in gratitude but in compassion. This is made evident by the fact that he volunteers his services without being asked to (Iwein 4775-79). In addition, Hartmann tells us that Iwein was moved by what he heard:

> Nû erbarmet diz sêre
> den rîter der des lewen pflac. (Iwein 4740-41)

Despite his promise, Iwein makes it clear to Gawan's brother-in-law that he can only fight the giant if he arrives early enough for the battle to be fought before noon, since he has promised to come to Lunete's aid as well (Iwein 4793-4802). It is evident, then, that Iwein's situation is precarious. He must fight and defeat the giant in the early morning and then quickly make his way back to the fountain to fight Lunete's accusers.

The following morning as he awaits the giant's arrival, he becomes anxious and intends to leave (Iwein 4827-34). The lord of the castle attempts to persuade him to stay by offering him compensation, but Iwein refuses. Interestingly enough, Iwein rejects fighting in exchange for compensation (Iwein 4842-45), yet this is just what he had done earlier for the lady of Narison. He had fought in gratitude for having been given a horse and armour. His refusal of the lord's offer indicates that he has changed inwardly since his encounter with the lion. Further evidence of Iwein's internal

change is the fact that he appears to relent only after the lord and his family appeal to his sense of compassion. Hartmann describes Iwein's reaction in the following way:

> Daz beweget im den muot:
> wan er was biderbe und guot.
> Man saget daz in betwunge
> diu tiure manunge,
> dô er ir dürfte rehte ervant
> und im sô ofte wart genant
> got und her Gâwein:
> wan swederm er under den zwein
> groezern unwillen truoc,
> dem dienter gerne genuoc. (Iwein 4859-68)

However, Iwein's indecision quickly returns. He realizes that he is in a dilemma. No matter whether he decides in favour of Lunete, Gawan's brother-in-law, or even both, he may not be able to help everybody and, consequently, may lose honour (Iwein 4870-75, 4884-86). He never has to make a final decision, however, for shortly after he asks God to provide him with a solution, the giant, Harpin, arrives as Iwein is wrestling with his conscience (Iwein 4887-92, 4914-17).[48]

The Harpin episode is interesting, since it shares a number of similarities with Hartmann's previous work (cf. Erec 5394-5416). In both Erec and Iwein knights are mistreated by giants (in the former it is two giants abusing one knight and in the latter it is one giant abusing four knights). In addition, both works share the motif of a knight being whipped by a dwarf (Iwein 4914-26/Erec 95-110).

Iwein is, of course, incensed that anyone would dare treat knights in such a manner (Iwein 4955-72) and rides out to do battle with the giant. After the usual exchange of threats, Iwein charges the giant, who apparently wears no

---

[48] McConeghy 370. McConeghy remarks: "As before, Iwein's loyalty to Gawein interferes with his responsibilities to the realm of Laudine and Lunete. While Iwein is now conscious of the dilemma in trying to serve both worlds, the issue is not yet resolved by Iwein himself, but by the fortuitous arrival of the giant."

armour. The result is that the shaft of Iwein's lance breaks off as it penetrates Harpin's chest (Iwein 5026-32). On his second charge, however, Iwein is knocked down by a blow from Harpin.

Noticing his master's peril, the lion enters the battle and attacks Harpin (Iwein 5050-62), which allows Iwein, who has in the meantime recovered, to kill the giant:

> ê er erzüge den andern slac,
> dô hete sich her Iwein
> mit vil grôzen wunden zwein
> an im vil wol gerochen
> und daz swert durch in gestochen
> dâ vor da daz herze lît.
> Dô was verendet der strît,
> und viel von der swaere
> als ez ein boum waere. (Iwein 5066-74).

Although the lion's participation in this battle seems unusual, it must be remembered that the lion only intervened when it thought that Iwein's life was in danger. In addition, it is Iwein who ends the battle not the lion. And, as always, the giant is shown no mercy by the knight, since he is an uncourtly creature. Thus, he represents a menace to courtly society that must be removed as quickly as possible.

Iwein refuses all offers of payment from Gawan's brother-in-law and asks only that he and his family ride to the Arthurian court and greet Gawan on his behalf. He does not, however, reveal his name, only that he travels with a lion at his side (Iwein 5120-26). This is another indication that Iwein has, at least for the time being, abandoned his old identity as an Arthurian knight.

This battle may be seen, then, as a continuation of the cycle which began when Iwein first rescued the lion. He devotes himself to helping those in need. In this connection, Borck summarizes:

> Auch im Kampf gegen den Riesen Harpin, der einem Schwager Gaweins und dessen Familie schweres Unrecht zugefügt hat, leistet Iwein unschuldig in Not geratenen Mitmenschen die dringend benötigte Hilfe. Aventiure als Wiederherstellung verletzten

> Rechts, als Akt des Erbarmens und als dankbar erwiesenen Freundesdienst.[49]

In this way, he sets himself apart from his Arthurian counterparts who were unwilling to lend assistance to Gawan's brother-in-law (Iwein 4510-27). It is, of course, mentioned that Gawan would have helped if he had known of the plight of his relatives, but he is off looking for Queen Ginover.

2. Abduction of Ginover

A knight named Meljaganz arrives at the Arthurian court and asks King Arthur to grant him a wish (Iwein 4530-42). Exercising some caution, Arthur tells him that he will grant any request provided that it is reasonable (Iwein 4543-46). The knight is outraged that his request would be subject to restrictions and slanders Arthur's name and reputation as he proceeds to storm off.

In response, the knights of the Round Table ask King Arthur to grant the request, since the apparently courtly knight will surely make a reasonable request. In addition, they note,

> 'Scheidet er von hinnen
> mit selhen unminnen,
> ern gesprichet niemer mêre
> dehein iuwer êre.' (Iwein 4575-78)

Their comments clearly indicate that they fear Meljaganz' displeasure could result in loss of honour for King Arthur and, by extension, for the Arthurian court.

After giving the matter due consideration, King Arthur calls Meljaganz back and unconditionally grants him his request. Meljaganz promptly responds by asking him to relinguish Queen Ginover (Iwein 4585-87). Arthur is naturally incensed at having been duped in such a manner and blames his knights for getting him into this awkward situation:

---

[49] Borck 12. Cf. Kraft 109, who states: " . . . Im Riesen besiegt Iwein die poetische Objektivierung seiner eigenen 'hôchvart'." This is a view which we, however, do not share.

> Er sprach 'wie bin ich überkomen!
> Die disen rât tâten,
> die hânt mich verrâten.' (Iwein 4590-92)

Since sîn wort daz was ein eit (Iwein 4584), King Arthur has no choice but to allow Meljaganz to take Queen Ginover.[50] To now renege on his promise would be more dishonourable than granting this painful, normally unacceptable, request.

Meljaganz rides off with Queen Ginover, and Keii is the first Arthurian knight to voice his displeasure:

> Dô sprach der herre Keiî
> 'in beschirmt der tiuvel noch got,
> der uns disen grôzen spot
> an mîner vrouwen hât getân,
> ezn müez im an sîn êre gân. (Iwein 4634-38)

In this regard, Kraft astutely observes,

> Am aufschlußreichsten ist wohl Keis Drohung gegen den Entführer . . . Sie bezeugt zum einen ein unbedingtes Vertrauen in die eigene ritterliche Tüchtigkeit, zum andern aber auch, daß nicht so sehr die Not der Königin, als vielmehr der 'spot' des Hofes, die eigene Schande, als größtes Unheil empfunden wird.[51]

In typical fashion, Keii's threats prove to be without substance, since he soon finds himself knocked off his horse by Meljaganz and left hanging in a tree (Iwein 4670-82).

An assortment of Arthurian knights do battle with Meljaganz and all find themselves unseated from their mounts. Gawan returns the following day and sets out in search of Ginover.

This episode is often seen as further evidence of Hartmann's criticism of Arthurian knighthood. Keller's comments are typical,

> Hartmann has here intentionally expanded

---

[50] Note that the act of a knight making a promise without assurances and being duped as a result is a popular medieval motif. Cf. Mabonagrin's promise to his amie in Erec 9487-9501, Laudine's promise to Iwein in Iwein 2913-25 and Marke's promise to Gandin in Tristan 13190-214.

[51] Kraft 116-17.

> Chretien's 22 verses dealing with a problem at Arthur's court into an episode of almost 200 verses in order to underline the absurdity of a strict interpretation of the Arthurian code.[52]

Perhaps of greater interest than the embarrassment faced by the Arthurian court is the fact that they appear to be immobilized by this crisis. Their need to restore their lost honour leaves them unable or unwilling to help those who come seeking their help (i.e. Lunete and Gawan's brother-in-law).[53] In this connection, Frey observes,

> Darin . . . zeigt sich der Artushof als handlungsunfähig, gelähmt und an erforderlicher Hilfeleistung gehindert. Dies ist ein weiterer Beleg für die Bestätigung der These von der Kritik an den Prinzipien des Artusrittertums im Iwein.[54]

The actions of the Arthurian knights may be directly compared with those of Iwein. Whereas they appear unwilling to aid those in need, Iwein--who has freed himself from the Arthurian concept of honour through his association with the lion--offers to help those in need out of a sense of compassion. His successes in this regard serve to highlight the shortcomings of the Arthurian court. The last word will be left to Kraft who espouses a similar view:

> Iwein . . . erscheint als der neue Held. Er beginnt sich zu lösen aus der sklavischen Bindung an die bedingte 'rîters triuwe', die von höfischer Norm bestimmt ist, und öffnet sich gegen die 'reine triuwe', die 'erbermde', die spontan auf die Notwende der Situation und den Nächsten

---

[52] Keller 73. Cf. Brandt 323, who, while not rejecting such a view of the abduction scene, notes that Hartmann's expansion of the episode may have been due, in part, to the fact that his German audience may not have been familiar with the story of Ginover's abduction which is to be found in Chrétien's Lancelot.

[53] Cf. Borck 13. He states: "Die Sorge um die eigene Reputation hat ihn [den Artushof] als Ort der Zuversicht für Notleidende neutralisiert."

[54] Frey 145.

> gerichtet ist. Gestaltet die Artushandlung gerade in der bedingungslosen Bejahung der 'êre'-fixierten 'rîters triuwe' deren Negation, so entwickelt vor diesem Hintergrund die umgreifende Harpin-Aventiure die Überwindung dieses Prinzips.[55]

3. Battle with the Steward

Iwein arrives in Laudine's kingdom to find Lunete about to be burned at the stake for treason. He immediately lets it be known that he is there to defend her innocence:

> Er rief und sprach 'lât genesen,
> übeliu diet, dise maget.
> Swaz man über sî hie claget,
> des wil ich in ir schulden stân:
> und sol sî dâ zuo kempfen hân,
> sô wil ich vehten vür sî.' (Iwein 5178-83)

After the usual exchange of unpleasantries, he begins to do battle with the steward and his two brothers.

The three brothers charge Iwein and shatter their lances on his shield (Iwein 5313-21). Iwein, however, wisely exercises restraint, according to Hartmann, and does not use his lance, but simply defends himself by using his shield (Iwein 5321-25). His lance is soon put to good use, however, as the steward charges ahead of his brothers to attack Iwein with his sword. Iwein's lance makes contact with the steward's chin and, as a result, he is knocked off his horse and remains unconscious (Iwein 5334-41).

The steward's brothers move in and begin fencing with Iwein. At this point, Iwein and his opponents are fairly well-matched, since Hartmann states that every one of Iwein's blows was worth two of theirs (Iwein 5346-50). The odds begin to change in favour of the brothers when the steward regains consciousness. It is at this point, when it appears that Iwein may lose, that the lion enters the battle. The lion tears the steward's armour to shreds and eventually kills him (Iwein 5375-88).

---

[55] Kraft 119.

The lion's intervention results in what can now be considered a fair fight, since, as Hartmann notes, it is now zwêne wider zwein (Iwein 5397). They both battle on against the two brothers until the lion is wounded. Iwein's concern for the lion's well-being results in renewed vigour for him:

> Daz bescheinder wol: wander brach
> sîne senfte gebaerde,
> von des lewen beswaerde
> gewan er zornes alsô vil
> daz er sî brâhte ûf daz zil
> daz sî gar verlurn ir kraft
> und gehabeten vor im zagehaft. (Iwein 5416-22)

Iwein defeats the two brothers in this trial by combat and thereby exonerates Lunete. Since Lunete's innocence has now been firmly established, the result is that it has also been proven that she was falsely accused. Thus, her accusers receive the same punishment that had been intended for her (Iwein 5429-37).

After his victory, Iwein is greeted by Laudine who does not recognize him. Although she asks him to remain so that she can tend to his wounds (and those of the lion), he refuses, noting:

> 'ichn gewinne gemach nochn wirde vrô
> niemer mê unz ûf den tac
> daz ich wider haben mac
> mîner vrouwen hulde:
> der mangel ich ân schulde.' (Iwein 5466-70)

His belief that he has been denied Laudine's favour without good reason is a bit of an anomaly, since he had earlier accepted full responsibility for his loss of her (Iwein 3964-68). One possible explanation for this comment is suggested by McConeghy who concludes:

> Iwein's attitude towards his guilt has changed since his conversation with Lunete at the chapel before he fought against Harpin . . . Lunete's guilt or innocence seems to be closely tied to his own.[56]

---

[56] McConeghy 373.

Iwein, then, appears to equate Lunete's innocence with his own.

He appears to contradict himself, however, for a short time later he speaks of his unwerdekheit (Iwein 5512). In addition, in response to Laudine's query as to which lady has denied him her favour, he says,

> Er sprach 'vrouwe, nein ich noch:
> ich muoz ir hulde ê haben baz.' (Iwein 5492-93)

It is clear, then, that, although he claims to be ân schulde, he also realizes that he has fallen out of favour with Laudine and that he still has a long way to go before he will once again be worthy of her.

Thus, he does not reveal his identity to Laudine when she asks him his name. Instead, he responds in the following way:

> 'Ich heize der rîter mit dem leun:
> und swer iu vür dise tage
> iht von einem rîter sage
> des geverte ein lewe sî,
> dâ erkennet mich bî.' (Iwein 5502-06)

It is important to note that this is the first time that Iwein identifies himself as the "Knight with the Lion." Earlier, after the Harpin battle, he told Gawan's brother-in-law to tell Gawan that he walks with a lion at his side, but did not refer to himself specifically as the "Knight with the Lion" (Iwein 5123-26).[57] In this way, Hartmann indicates that Iwein now identifies himself exclusively with the lion. The lion is now a part of him rather than just a pleasant travelling companion.

In this connection, Borck observes,

> Fortan ist Iwein der ritter mittem leun. Er legt seinen alten Namen ab und mit ihm das alte

---

[57] Cf. McConeghy 372, who notes that line 5263 represents the "first instance where Hartmann uses 'The Knight with the Lion' as a name. Earlier instances were descriptive." Thus, Hartmann's usage of this pseudonym parallels that of his protagonist.

> Selbstverständnis . . . Der Löwenritter beruft sich nicht auf seine Ahnen und ist auch nicht darauf aus, sein persönliches Ansehen zu mehren. Für ihn zählt nur das Ethos. So erklärt sich seine beharrliche Forderung: ich wil sîn erkant bî mînem lewen (5496f.).[58]

Iwein's identification with the lion is an indication that he has finally found the type of knighthood he was looking for when he first awoke in the wilderness (Iwein 3569-74). Although he at that time spoke of honour, it is apparent that he does not solely seek honour as he did when acting in accordance with Kalogrenant's âventiure definition. He acts primarily out of compassion and derives honour as a result.

4. Battle with the Giants/Devil's Henchmen

Iwein arrives at a castle where his wounds are looked after. He and the lion stay there for fourteen days until they have both fully recovered from their injuries (Iwein 5621-24).

During Iwein's sojourn at the castle, Hartmann tells us of a situation unfolding elsewhere. The Count of the Black Thorn dies, and his property is to be divided up equally amongst his two daughters. The older daughter, however, tries to force her younger sister into giving up her share of the inheritance (Iwein 5635-38).

The younger sister responds by challenging her sister to a battle in order to settle the matter and states that she will journey to the Arthurian court to find a champion to defend her honour (Iwein 5648-62). The older sister, however, races to the Arthurian court ahead of her (in much the same way that Iwein had raced to the fountain to fight Ascalon) and immediately enlists the aid of Gawan (Iwein 5668-69). It is interesting to note that Gawan offers to assist her only

---

[58] Borck 11. Cf. Keller 73, who states: "It is after defeating the three brothers and saving Lunete from death, as he becomes conscious of his relationship with the lion, that Iwein makes his final break from the Arthurian world."

if she agrees not to reveal his identity to anyone (Iwein 5675-77). Although it is clear that the narrative requires Gawan's anonymity so that he and Iwein may later do battle without knowing the other's identity, it is, perhaps, also possible that Gawan's request reflects his own uncertainty about the cause he has taken up. It must be stated, however, that Hartmann does not indicate what was said to Gawan and what his motives are for requiring anonymity. Thus, we can only speculate as to what his motives may have been.

The younger sister arrives at court and (like Lunete and Gawan's brother-in-law before her) is unable to find anyone to take up her cause (Iwein 5699-5702). Gawan, whom she was hoping to enlist, is also unavailable, since he has already promised to help her sister (Iwein 5703-14).

Thus, she sets off in search of the "Knight with the Lion" whose fame has already reached the Arthurian court (Iwein 5682-98). After searching to no avail, she arrives at her uncle's castle where she stays to recuperate from the illness brought on by her arduous journeying (Iwein 5767-76). At her request her cousin is sent out to continue the search for the "Knight with the Lion" and, in so doing, retraces much of the path previously taken by Iwein after his disgrace at the Arthurian court. She travels through a forest (Iwein 5780-81), arrives at the castle of Gawan's brother-in-law (Iwein 5802-54), then comes to the fountain (Iwein 5872-75) where Lunete gives her directions.

The fact that she retraces much of Iwein's path (with the exception of the castle of the lady of Narison where Iwein acted without the lion) serves to highlight his many accomplishments since having left the Arthurian court. At each stop, she is told of how the "Knight with the Lion" fought successfully on behalf of people in need. In addition to providing her with hope that he will take up her cousin's cause, the eyewitness accounts of his deeds of arms illustrate once again the shortcomings of the Arthurian

court. All of the people whom the "Knight with the Lion" helped had first sought aid at the Arthurian court and were turned down. In addition, the younger sister of the Black Thorn who now seeks Iwein's help through her messenger had also been refused help at the Arthurian court. The only Arthurian knight to help any outsider is Gawan and, when he does, he does so for an unjust cause (i.e. for the older sister).[59] Thus, the Arthurian court is seen to be a place where aid on behalf of the oppressed is sorely wanting.

The cousin arrives at the castle where Iwein and his lion recuperated (Iwein 5925-30) and, finally, meets up with the two some distance away. After hearing her plea, Iwein consents to help her cousin:

> Er sprach 'ichn habe gnâden niht:
> swem mîns dienstes nôt geschiht
> und swer guoter des gert,
> dern wirt es niemer entwert.' (Iwein 6001-04)

Iwein's comments reveal that he will help anyone in need of help whose cause is good. In this way, he stands apart from Gawan who apparently agrees to help the older sister simply because she asks for help, but does not appear to ascertain whether her cause is good (i.e. just). In this connection, Kraft remarks,

> Wie Artus jede Bitte erfüllt, so setzt sich sein erster Ritter für jeden Hilfesuchenden ein, ungeachtet dessen, ob es gerechtfertigt ist. Iwein dagegen weiß wohl auszuwählen und ist sich seiner Aufgabe und Verantwortung voll bewußt; das zeigen schon seine Worte bei der Begrüßung der Botin.[60]

---

[59] Cf. Giloy-Hirtz 259. Cf. Sieverding 128, who states: "Es gehört ebenfalls zum Wesen von Gerichtskämpfen, daß man den Kämpfenden nicht die moralische Verantwortung für die von ihnen vertretene Sache zuschreiben darf . . . Eine sittliche Verurteilung Gaweins aufgrund seines Eintretens für die ältere Schwarzdorn-Schwester . . . erscheint daher nicht berechtigt."

[60] Kraft 159. Cf. Meng 70, who states: "Iwein hingegen ist sich der Verantwortung bewußt, die er bei einem Gerichtskampf übernimmt und darauf bedacht, nur berechtigten

One critic who takes issue with this view of Gawan is Sinka who notes with respect to Gawans's refusal to help the younger sister of the Black Thorn,

> Gawein's unwavering attitude at this juncture of the epic has been cited as proof of the rigidity of the Arthurian code and as evidence of the entire Arthurian world's culpability. Yet, why should a breach of promise be more justified for the members of Arthur's court than for Iwein?[61]

Sinka certainly makes a valid point. Gawan cannot be expected to retract his promise of service to the older sister in favour of helping the younger one. Such an act would be dishonourable. The fault with the Arthurian code appears to be that adherence to it resulted in Gawan's offering his services on a first-come first-serve basis without regard for the merit of the cause to which he committed himself. The Arthurian code proves, then, to be as rigid as Kalogrenant's <u>âventiure</u> definition, since both require a knight to fight without giving him the option of deciding when and for whom he should fight. Iwein, who faces no such restrictions, is free to choose and does not offer his services to the younger sister until he has listened to the messenger's story and determined the cause to be a just one.[62]

Iwein and the messenger travel onward and arrive at a marketplace where they are scorned by the people there (<u>Iwein</u>

Hilfegesuchen zu entsprechen . . . "

[61] Margit M. Sinka, " 'Der höfschste man': An Analysis of Gawein's role in Hartmann von Aue's <u>Iwein</u>," <u>Modern Language Notes</u> 96 (1981): 481-482.

[62] Cf. Sinka 483, who believes that Iwein also offered his services without due consideration. Our analysis, however, suggests otherwise. She also states that, unlike Gawan, Iwein is never forced to choose between a just and an unjust cause (482). She fails to realize, however, that Gawan was also not forced to make a choice. Once he gave his word to the older sister, he simply could not renege on his promise.

6088-6107). A young woman informs Iwein that the people's rudeness stems from the fact that they would like him to avoid the nearby castle (Iwein 6125-42). It turns out that the people have been forbidden to provide lodging to any traveller in order that he be required to seek lodging at the castle where he faces possible death.

With nowhere else to go and with nightfall rapidly approaching, Iwein and his retinue decide to head for the castle. Once there they are maligned by a sinister gatekeeper whose threats Iwein ignores, since he sees no danger (Iwein 6183-85). As he explores the castle, Iwein comes upon a workshop filled with 300 emaciated and poorly dressed women. Upon inquiring about their condition, Iwein learns that they come from a land whose young lord rode out in search of âventiure (Iwein 6319-31). He arrived at the castle and was forced to do battle with two giants. Lacking both experience and strength, he admitted defeat without actually fighting and, as a result, had to agree to send the giants thirty young women as hostages every year (Iwein 6354-68). This agreement may only be rescinded if another knight is able to defeat both giants in battle.

Moved by the women's desperate situation, Iwein immediately offers to free them from their imposed slavery (Iwein 6406-24). He searches for the lord of the castle and finds him and his family outside in a beautiful orchard. The treatment he receives from them is magnanimous, and he soon wonders what price he will have to pay for their generosity towards him (Iwein 6546-68).[63]

The following morning he attempts to take his leave and

---

[63] Cf. Patrick M. McConeghy, "Aventiure and Anti-aventiure in Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lancelot and Hartmann von Aue's Iwein," Germanic Review 57 (1982): 67. He notes the disparity between the treatment of the three hundred women and that of Iwein and believes that, in this way, "Hartmann fully unmasks the deceptive and hollow nature of courtly joy and ties it directly to his anti-aventiure message."

discovers that the treatment he received does have a price. The lord of the castle informs him that he must fight against two giants and, should he defeat them, he would then be entitled to the lord's land and his daughter's hand in marriage (Iwein 6592-6609). Iwein refuses to participate until he realizes that he really has no choice in the matter.

The giants' bodies are covered by armour with the exception of their heads, arms, and legs (Iwein 6679-82). In addition, these two uncourtly creatures carry clubs. It is of interest that they immediately voice their displeasure upon seeing the lion, since its participation in the battle would result in even odds of zwêne wider zwein (Iwein 6699).[64]

With the lion locked up in a nearby shed from which he can observe, but not participate, the battle begins. The giants' assault results in Iwein's shield being reduced to nothing, and, thus, he has no way to protect himself from the giants' further onslaught (Iwein 6722-26). It comes as no surprise, then, that Iwein soon finds his armour rendered useless.

At this point, the lion sees Iwein's plight and manages to free himself from the shed (Iwein 6737-51). He immediately attacks one of the giants, biting him and clawing at those parts of his body which are not covered by armour. His actions distract the other giant, who turns away from Iwein and heads toward the lion. Iwein then strikes the unprotected parts of his body and then, with the lion's help, kills him (Iwein 6785-87). The other giant who is still alive begs for mercy which Iwein then grants him (Iwein 6791-94).

With Iwein emerging victorious, the lord of the castle

---

[64] Cf. Iwein 5287-91 where the steward also fears the lion's participation in the battle. Cf. Keller 70, who notes that there is a progression from the Harpin battle to the battle with the steward to this battle in which "the lion becomes more and more restrained." He believes that "through the figure of the lion, Iwein learns self-control."

has no choice but to free the 300 enslaved women which he promptly does. Although he then tries to force Iwein to marry his daughter, he does so to no avail, for Iwein concedes that he would make a poor husband, since he loves another (i.e. Laudine--Iwein 6799-6810).[65]

This battle is the last one in which Iwein fights alongside his lion, and it is interesting to note that the lion's role remains essentially the same in all of the battles. In this connection, Keller observes,

> In all three battles Iwein begins fighting without the lion and only later, when the lion realizes that his master is fighting against uneven odds, does the animal intervene and insure victory.[66]

One important difference, however, arises in the last battle where Hartmann explicitly states that Iwein faces overwhelming odds (Iwein 6719-21). As a result, the lion not only evens the odds, but also defeats both of Iwein's opponents virtually singlehandedly. In the previous battles, Iwein was able to bring the battle to an end on his own after the lion evened the odds, but in the last battle he requires the lion's help to the very end.

Lastly, as has been stated throughout this chapter, Iwein's battles are fought out of a sense of compassion. In this regard, this battle against the giants is no exception. Sieverding views it similarly,

> In der Pesme Aventiure vertritt Iwein in exemplarischer Weise ein Rittertum, das mit der im ersten Handlungszyklus dominanten Konzeption des Artusrittertums nur noch wenig gemein hat. Grundlage ritterlichen Bemühens ist nicht mehr das

---

[65] Cf. Borck 12, who observes: "Die Gesetze der costume, für den Artusritter unabweisbares Gebot, haben für Iwein ihre Verbindlichkeit verloren. Maxime des Löwenrittertums ist allein der selbstlose Dienst am notleidenden Nächsten."

[66] Keller 68.

> Streben nach Ehre, sondern das "erbermde'-Motiv.[67]

It is at this point that Iwein finds himself at the peak of his knightly prowess and is now ready to engage the paragon of Arthurian knighthood, Gawan.

5. Final Battle with Gawan

After returning the 300 women to their land, Iwein and his retinue head to the castle where the younger sister of the Black Thorn is staying. She and Iwein then depart for the Arthurian court, arriving just in time for the battle (Iwein 6878-83).[68]

The fine appearance of both Iwein and Gawan has such a profound affect on the Arthurian court that its members plead with King Arthur to arrange for the older sister to share the inheritance with her younger sibling (Iwein 6895-21). The older sister refuses, however, and, as a result, the members of the Arthurian court move to the arena to let the battle begin.

In contrast to the previous battles that Iwein has fought, Hartmann now indicates his unwillingness to describe this battle. He states,

> Machte ich diz vehten
> von disen guoten knehten
> mit worten nû vil spaehe,
> waz töhte diu waehe?
> Wand iu ist ê sô vil geseit
> von ietweders manheit

---

[67] Sieverding 155. Cf. Keller 74, who remarks: "In fighting the two giants in the Pesme Aventiure, there is no doubt, no conflict of interest. Although there is still an indirect tie to Gawein through the younger daughter vom Schwarzen Dorn, Iwein undertakes this adventure on his own out of compassion and a sense of what is right and not just to further his own esteem."

[68] Cf. Keller 74, who notes the lion's absence in this battle is due to the fact that "Iwein is now fighting according to his old rules and the lion as a symbol of restraint is not needed here" and that his previous battles "were fought against obviously evil forces."

daz ich in lîuhte mac gesagen
daz sî niender zwein zagen
des tages gelîch gebârten
und daz als ê bewârten
daz diu werlt nie gewan
zwêne strîtiger man
nâch werltlîchem lône. (Iwein 6939-52)

He goes on to tell his audience that a victory for either man would prove to be a tragedy and that he wishes both could be victorious. In this way, he alludes to the battle's end (Iwein 6956-71).

That the battle will end in a stalemate is also made evident by the fact that on their first charge both Iwein and Gawan aim their lances exactly as they should and thus nearly manage to simultaneously unseat one another (Iwein 7075-96). All that prevents each man from falling to the ground is the fact that both lances shatter upon making contact with the other man's shield.

After using up all of their lances, Iwein and Gawan continue doing battle on foot. As one would expect when the two best knights do battle, both fight according to the rules of chivalry. Hartmann tells us that neither man gave any thought to striking the other below the knees (i.e. below the other's shield--Iwein 7139-42).

As the battle progresses, their shields are soon reduced to nothing, and they fight on with only their armour to protect them (Iwein 7219-34). The battle continues from early morning until late in the evening with only a brief respite in the afternoon.

The battle is suspended when it becomes too dark to fight, and it is then that Iwein seeks out his adversary. Iwein commends Gawan for his fighting ability, and the latter returns the favour (Iwein 7413-45). Their mutual admiration eventually leads to Gawan's divulging of his identity to Iwein (Iwein 7470-71) which is, of course, followed by the same gesture on Iwein's part.

After much revelation about their reunion, each, in

turn, admits defeat to the other which results in a stalemate. King Arthur is informed of the situation, and it is at this point that Gawan admits that he had been fighting for an unjust cause (Iwein 7620-30).

The conflict between the two sisters of the Black Thorn is finally resolved by King Arthur who informs the elder sister that Gawan has admitted defeat, and that if she does not agree to share the inheritance with her sister, he will accept Gawan's surrender. Acceptance of the latter would, of course, result in her losing the entire inheritance to her younger sister. Thus, she immediately agrees to share the inheritance, and the two sisters are reconciled.

This battle between Gawan, paragon of Arthurian knighthood, and Iwein, "Knight with the Lion," has resulted in some debate in the secondary literature. Pütz, for example, implies that Iwein is superior to Gawan, since Gawan is the first to reveal his name:

> Beide Kämpfer erscheinen als gleichwertig. Als das offenbar wird, zieht Iwein die Konsequenz und beendet den sinnlosen Kampf, der nach der Anlage des Werks doch wahrscheinlich nur damit enden könnte, daß er seinen Freund Gawein tötete. Das paßt nicht mehr in Iweins Einstellung zum ritterlichen Kampf. Zudem hat Gawein als erster seinen Namen genannt und sich damit formal als Unterlegener ausgewiesen.[69]

Pütz fails to realize, however, that Gawan mentions his name at Iwein's request and not as a sign of defeat (Iwein: lines 7414-7432). In addition, Hartmann makes numerous references to how equally-matched the two are. And, lastly, they both admit defeat.

In this regard, Sinka asks,

> If Hartmann had wanted to accent Iwein's superiority, if he had wanted to stress that Iwein's cause is so righteous while Gawein's is not - why did he not wish Iwein to win so that the

---

[69] Pütz 197.

younger sister's cause would triumph?[70]

While we agree that Hartmann does not make a point of stressing Iwein's superiority over Gawan--the two are portrayed as equals--, Iwein nonetheless battles for the just cause, whereas Gawan does not. It is our belief that Hartmann's criticism is levelled at the Arthurian court and not at Gawan per se. To have Gawan, the ideal Arthurian knight, lose to Iwein would constitute rejection of Arthurian knighthood, rather than simply criticism of it.

In light of the fact that Iwein is shown to be equal to Gawan, the question arises as to what purpose this battle may serve. Keller provides a possible answer:

> The Gawein battle is needed to show that Iwein is again equal in prowess to the best of the Arthurian knights. In this way, the Knight with the Lion can reintroduce himself as Iwein, albeit as a new Iwein hoping now to be acceptable to Laudine. He had begun his knightly career anew after his <u>wân</u> and had established a new reputation as a champion ready to protect women and defend the right.[71]

Iwein proves his mettle against Gawan and wins renewed acceptance at the Arthurian court. But this Iwein is far different from the Iwein who broke his promise to Laudine.

One indication of Iwein's change is the somewhat mysterious reappearance of his lion at the Arthurian court (<u>Iwein</u> 7727-44). Another is the fact that, in contrast to his earlier sojourn at the Arthurian court when he was so engrossed in tournaments that he forgot about Laudine, he can now think of nothing other than her (<u>Iwein</u> 7781-7804). In this connection, Sieverding remarks,

> Diese Orientierung auf Laudine hin bedeutet für Iwein die gedankliche Entfernung von den Wertvorstellungen des Artushofes und damit auch

---

[70] Sinka 484-485.

[71] Keller 74.

> von der 'aventiure'-Ideologie.[72]

And Pütz adds,

> Der Artushof . . . ist nicht mehr erstrebtes Endziel, sondern nur noch Zwischenstation . . .[73]

Thus, Iwein leaves the Arthurian court and returns to the fountain. Once again Lunete is the catalyst that brings him together with Laudine. She convinces Laudine that the "Knight with the Lion" would be an excellent choice to guard the fountain. In addition, she has Laudine swear an oath that she will do everything in her power to help the "Knight with the Lion" regain his lady's favour (Iwein 7867-7938). Lunete then goes out to look for Iwein and finds him at the fountain.

Once Laudine discovers that the "Knight with the Lion" is Iwein, she is upset at first, but then realizes that she must abide by the oath that she swore to Lunete. In this way, Iwein is reconciled with Laudine. It is important to note, however, that, although this episode is quite similar to that which followed the slaying of Ascalon, there is one important difference. Iwein, through his association with the lion, has become a knight whose actions are guided by compassion. Thus, we may expect that he will pay more heed to his wife than he had previously, since this would be in keeping with his knighthood. Willson shares a similar opinion:

---

[72] Sieverding 96-97.

[73] Pütz, 197.

Cf. Kraft, 168, who observes: "In der Darstellung seiner Integrität und der Prinzipien, auf denen sie beruht, wird gerade im Moment der Reintegration in die Artuswelt deutlich, daß er bereits über diese hinausgewachsen ist und in einem umfassenderen und höheren Sinn Rittertum verwirklicht."

Cf. Keller, 74-75, who remarks: "Through the lion Iwein has learned restraint and mistrust of part of the knightly ideal and also the meaning and importance of the type of relationship he is to have with Laudine."

> The leading motive of Iwein is the hero's gradual attainment of caritas in his relations with his fellows, above all, with his wife, which symbolizes the attainment of knightly perfection.[74]

One last issue of note is whether Iwein represents Hartmann's rejection of the Arthurian realm. One critic who thinks it does is Pütz. He comments,

> Mit Iwein überwindet aber auch Hartmann selbst die Artuswelt. Mit diesem Epos kehrt Hartmann daher nicht eigentlich zur arthurischen Epik zurück, sondern hier wendet er sich deutlich kritisch davon ab.[75]

While it is true that Hartmann appears more critical of the Arthurian court in Iwein than he does in Erec, it is not fair to say that he rejects it outright.

Although Iwein's initial failure as an Arthurian knight and then his subsequent success as a non-Arthurian knight illustrates some of the shortcomings inherent in adherence to the tenets of Arthurian knighthood, this by no means invalidates Arthurian knighthood. The Arthurian court itself, as a society of ideal knights remains essentially unchanged throughout Iwein.

Hartmann simply criticizes it by pointing out its limitations. In addition, he presents an alternative ideal as represented by Iwein and his lion. Hartmann's ideal in Iwein, then, is a type of knighthood whose adherents aid those in need (i.e. the oppressed). Although Iwein leaves the Arthurian court, it remains intact. Thus, we are left at the end of the work with two communities: the Arthurian community and Laudine's kingdom. Each one represents a different type of ideal knighthood: the former represents Arthurian knighthood and the latter Hartmann's ideal based upon compassion. The presence of one, however, does not exclude

---

[74] Willson 152.

[75] Pütz 197.

the other. In this regard, the final word is left to Gürttler who concludes,

> Kritische Distanz wird an manchen Stellen spürbar, einen 'Anti-Artusroman' hat Hartmann jedoch nicht geschrieben.[76]

D. Summary

The picture of knighthood drawn by Hartmann is strongly reflected in the development of the protagonist in Iwein. In the beginning, Iwein is a flawed Arthurian knight whose all-consuming need for honour and recognition causes him to disobey King Arthur by racing to the magic fountain to challenge Ascalon. After slaying Ascalon and marrying his widow, Laudine, Iwein eventually returns to his life as a bachelor Arthurian knight.

This latter act represents the low point of Iwein's career as an Arthurian knight, for he dedicates himself so fully to the knightly life that he neglects his wife, Laudine. The result is that he loses Laudine which causes him to go mad.

After his bout with madness and brief existence as a "wild man," Iwein returns to a life of chivalry. His first act of chivalry is to aid the Lady of Narison in gratitude for her help in returning him to courtly society.

Subsequently, Iwein encounters a lion engaged in battle with a dragon and rescues the lion. This event represents a pivotal point in Iwein's development as a knight. After his rescue of the lion, Iwein (in the company of the lion) begins to engage in a series of battles where he acts primarily out

---

[76] Gürttler 62. Cf. Salmon 66, who observes: "There are some . . . discrepancies [between the versions of Hartmann and Chrétien]: Gawein's enlistment on the 'wrong' side, the abduction of Guenevere, and the misadventure of Kalogreant at the spring have all been taken to show that all was not well with King Arthur's court, and that the work is in fact a critique of the pretense of chivalrous society-and Iwein's lion then becomes the symbol of the natural forces to which the hero must ally himself if he is to be more than a sham."

of a sense of compassion.

It may be concluded, then, that, in Iwein, Hartmann's ideal of knighthood is one in which the knight, acting compassionately, fights on behalf of the oppressed. Honour is derived as a result, but is not the goal in and of itself.

Hartmann's espousal of a compassion-based knighthood implies a strong criticism of Arthurian knighthood. There are two main criticisms. The first and most obvious criticism is that Arthurian knighthood is not based upon compassion. One example which illustrates this point is the episode in which the younger daughter of the Count of the Black Thorn arrives at the Arthurian court to seek help in her inheritance dispute with her elder sister. No one was willing to take up her cause (Iwein 5699-5714). In the end, she managed, with the help of a messenger, to enlist the aid of Iwein, "the Knight with the Lion." A related criticism is that Arthurian knighthood is not selective in taking sides. Again, the same episode helps to illustrate this point. The elder daughter of the Count of the Black Thorn, whose cause was unjust, was able to obtain the assistance of Gawan who did not appear to determine whether her cause was just. In contrast, Iwein, "the Knight with the Lion," did not offer his services to the younger daughter of the Count of the Black Thorn until he was satisfied that her cause was just and, therefore, warranted compassionate aid (Iwein 5668-69; 6001-04). The second main criticism of Arthurian knighthood is that it over-emphasizes a concept of âventiure whose primary feature is the requirement to do battle with any other knight encountered; a feature which does not give the Arthurian knight the freedom and flexibility to judge for himself whether a particular encounter with another knight warrants battle. In contrast, Iwein rejects this concept of âventiure and replaces it with the philosophy of the Waldmensch which holds that "anyone who does him no wrong, should be treated as a friend (Iwein 484-85). This philosophy combined with

compassion allows Iwein to do battle only with those who do either him or others wrong. A related criticism is that Arthurian knighthood is self-centred, requiring the Arthurian knight to ride out in search of honour, whereas the knighthood represented by Iwein, "the Knight with the Lion," is more selfless, since it is guided by the suffering of others.

These criticisms do not, however, imply an outright rejection of Arthurian knighthood. In this respect, it is important to remember that the Arthurian court remains intact at the end of the work as does Iwein's and Laudine's kingdom. The reason for the Arthurian court's continued activity is that Arthurian knighthood does have a number of positive features such as being civilized, disciplined, well-intentioned, powerful, restrained, stable, and loyal.

The type of knighthood posited by Hartmann takes these good points of Arthurian knighthood and adds to them compassion. As well, when Hartmann's ideal knight, as represented by Iwein, encounters difficulties in carrying out his acts of compassion, his companion, the lion, who represents Christ, helps him to overcome these obstacles and carry out his mission.

IV. GOTTFRIED VON STRASSBURG'S Tristan

Gottfried von Straßburg occupies a unique position in medieval literature, for, though his Tristan is accorded a place of honour alongside the Erec and Iwein of Hartmann von Aue and the Parzival of Wolfram von Eschenbach, his own inimitable and masterful treatment of the Tristan legend sets him apart not only from his predecessors (i. e. Béroul, Eilhart, and Thomas of Brittany), but also from his contemporaries. In this connection, Krohn observes,

> Zwar zählen wir den "Tristan" ebenso zu den höfischen Romanen wie etwa den "Parzival", den "Erec" oder "Iwein" - Stoffe allesamt, die als "matière de Bretagne" aus der altfranzösischen Literatur entlehnt und ins Mittelhochdeutsche übertragen wurden. Und doch unterscheidet der Straßburger sich spürbar von seinen dichtenden Zeitgenossen.[1]

One way in which Gottfried differs from his contemporaries such as Hartmann is that he has written a courtly romance which is not at the same time an Arthurian romance. Consequently, his Tristan lacks many of the features of an Arthurian romance such as the Arthurian court, the concept of âventiure, and the connection between minne and knighthood, all of which were prevalent in our analyses of Erec and Iwein.[2]

The absence of such features in Gottfried's Tristan has led critics such as W. T. H. Jackson to suggest that Gottfried may have intended to demonstrate the limitations of

---

[1] Gottfried von Straßburg, Tristan, vol. 3: Kommentar, Nachwort und Register, ed. and trans. Rüdiger Krohn (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1981) 216.

[2] Cf. Krohn 216-217. Cf. Helmut de Boor, Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang 1170-1250 (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953) 133. Cf. ---, "Die Grundauffassung von Gottfrieds Tristan," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 18 (1940): 280, 281. Cf. Peter K. Stein, "Tristans Schwertleite. Zur Einschätzung ritterlich-höfischer Dichtung durch Gottfried von Straßburg," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 51 (1977): 344.

the courtly romance, while at the same time giving an indication of what could be done had the Tristan legend been available to him in another genre:

> His own purpose was to show the inadequacy of the genre to indicate that he could find none better, and then to take the reader into his confidence and ask him to look carefully at what he found in the Tristan and thus appreciate in what ways the poem differed from the work of his contemporaries.[3]

While this view certainly has merit, it must also be noted that Gottfried's source for his Tristan differed from Hartmann's source for his Erec and Iwein. Whereas Hartmann chose Chrétien, the originator of the Arthurian romance, as his source, Gottfried chose Thomas of Brittany. It follows, then, that Gottfried would not have written an Arthurian romance, since Thomas of Brittany's Tristram was not an Arthurian romance. In addition, Gottfried appears to have been a strong proponent of the belief that a medieval poet was expected to be true to his source.[4] Thus, Gottfried's deviation from the Arthurian model goes back to his choice of source not his mode of adaptation.

Literary criticism concerning Gottfried's Tristan has

---

[3] W. T. H. Jackson, "The Literary Views of Gottfried von Straßburg," Publications of the Modern Language Association 85 (1970): 1001. Cf. Stein 349. Stein believes: "Der Grund warum Gottfried den Artusroman Chrétiens und Hartmanns ablehnen mußte, war die Tatsache, daß dort Probleme nur kasuistische waren und kasuistisch gelöst, aber nicht existenziell dargestellt wurden."

[4] The modern concept of originality was foreign to medieval poets, who were expected to base their work on that of a source. The work that resulted can be thought of as a translation of the source work with some embellishment. An indication that this was accepted practice is to be found in Gottfried's literary excursus in his Tristan in which he takes to task an unnamed poet--generally believed to be Wolfram von Eschenbach--for (among other things) straying from his source by referring to him as a vindaere wilder maere, der maere wildenaere (Tristan 4665-4666). Cf. Krohn 237.

tended to view it as being a work which rejects knighthood. In 1940 de Boor noted,

> Allein es ist längst erkannt, wie sehr Gottfried die ritterlich-kriegerischen Komponente in seinem Bilde dieser Welt zugunsten höfisch-gesellschaftlicher Geschliffenheit und Bildung zurückdrängt.[5]

Later, in 1977, Stein observed,

> Der Aventiure-Kampf des Artusromans ist stilisiert, gehorcht bestimmten Regeln, sein Ideal ist eigentlich der Turnierzweikampf. Gottfried hat offenbar eine völlig andere Ansicht vom Kämpfen.[6]

And, in 1981, Krohn alleged,

> Bezeichnenderweise richtet sich Gottfrieds Kritik . . . gegen die sinnleere Demonstration ritterlicher Kampfeslust um ihrer selbst willen.[7]

It is clear, then, that critics have been fairly consistent in their appraisal of Gottfried's treatment of knighthood.

In an attempt to explain Gottfried's alleged rejection of knighthood, several critics have turned to his social status for answers. Having ascertained that Gottfried was not a knight, they have made the assumption that he must have

---

[5] Helmut de Boor, "Die Grundauffassung von Gottfrieds Tristan," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 18 (1940): 276. Cf. Helmut de Boor, Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang 1170-1250 (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953) 135. He remarks: "Für Gottfried sind die ritterlich-kämpferischen Motive, die sein Stoff enthält, ohne Eigenwert. Sie sind nur Hebel, um Handlung in Bewegung zu setzen."

[6] Stein 338. Cf. Madeleine Pelner Cosman, The Education of the Hero in Arthurian Romance (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1966) 43. She comments: "As these are exemplified in the romance literature of his day, Gottfried laughs at traditional chivalry and traditional Minne." Cf. Ruth Goldschmidt Kunzer, The Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg. An Ironic Perspective (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973) 38. She concludes: "While Hartmann and especially Wolfram, are generally said to apply humor in their criticism of knighthood, Gottfried uses irony, and at times sarcasm and parody."

[7] Krohn 222.

been a member of the bourgeoisie.[8] In addition, they have also made the assumption that the bourgeoisie were either unable or unwilling to understand knighthood. Lastly, this attitude has been ascribed to Gottfried and--by extension--to his Tristan as a brief survey of the various critics reveals. In 1939 Grundmann stated,

> Mit Gottfried pocht das bürgerliche Zeitalter an die Pforte der höfisch-ritterlichen Kultur. Es ist möglich, ablehnend, fast verächtlich von dem wichtigsten ritterlichen Betätigungsgebiete, dem Kampf, zu sprechen, und das in einem Werke, das dem ritterlichen Leben gewidmet sein sollte.[9]

Later, in 1953, de Boor observed,

> Wolfram entwickelt seine Welt vom schildes ambet her, dem tätigen Rittertum, das sich im Artusrittertum rein darstellt. Gottfried entwickelt sie vom gebildeten Manne her, zu dem ritterliche Qualitäten zwar gehören, die ihn aber nicht bestimmen.[10]

And, as late as 1981, this view of Gottfried as opposing chivalry due to his alleged bourgeois status persists. Krohn,

---

[8] Gottfried Weber und Werner Hoffmann, Gottfried von Straßburg, 5th ed. (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1981) 4. Weber notes: "Übereinstimmung herrscht einmal darüber, daß Gottfried kein Ritter gewesen ist . . . "

[9] Karl Grundmann, Studien zur Speerkampfschilderung im Mittelhochdeutschen. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des höfischen Stil- und Lebensgefühls (Warsaw: Josef Piludski University, 1939) 222. Note that Grundmann errs in assuming that Gottfried's Tristan is a work dedicated to the knightly life. Gottfried clearly tells us in his prologue that his work is dedicated to lovers who know that love and sorrow are inseparable. Cf. Gustav Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Anfang des Mittelalters, vol. 2, part 2, 1st half (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927) 133. He remarks: "Hartmann und Wolfram treffen zusammen als Standesgenossen in der hohen Schätzung des Rittertums gegenüber dem bürgerlichen Sänger Gotfrid, dem Verherrlicher der absoluten Herrschaft der Minne."

[10] de Boor Die höfische Literatur 135.

for example, remarked,

> Gottfrieds "Tristan" ist - bei allen Einschränkungen ein höfischer Roman in dem auch die bürgerliche Oberschicht sich wiedererkennen sollte [my emphasis] - und wollte.[11]

Despite the apparent softening of this position with respect to Gottfried's view of knighthood, it nevertheless remains a dominant feature of current literary criticism concerning Gottfried's Tristan.

Gottfried's alleged bourgeois status has also been used to support the view that Gottfried rejects the court and its conventions. Of particular importance in this regard is the prologue in Gottfried's Tristan, which was probably not found in his source. In the prologue Gottfried alludes to the love shared by Tristan and Isolde; a love which due to its extra-marital nature is considered by some critics to be uncourtly.[12] In addition, Gottfried dedicates his work to a select group referred to as the edele herzen rather than to the entirety of courtly society:

> Ich hân mir eine unmüezekeit
> der werlt ze liebe vür geleit
> und edelen herzen z'einer hage,
> den herzen, den ich herze trage,
> der werlde, in die mîn herze siht.
> ine meine ir aller werlde niht
> als die, von der ich hoere sagen,
> diu keine swaere enmüge getragen

---

[11] Krohn 222-223.

[12] One such critic is Goldschmidt Kunzer 200, who states: "The greatest contrast between Tristan and other epics arises from the uncourtliness of the Tristan minne, which, in its spontaneity and obsessive passion, is the very opposite of the ideal of courtly love." Goldschmidt Kunzer, however, fails to realize that there is not just one ideal of courtly love. As will become evident during the course of this thesis Gottfried's view of love also reflects an ideal of courtly love.

und niwan in vröuden welle sweben.[13]

This dedication has led a number of critics to suggest that Gottfried's intended audience may have been his fellow bourgeoisie rather than (or, in addition to) the nobility. One such critic is Krohn, who asserts,

> . . . entscheidend ist, daß er sich also an ein ausgewähltes Publikum richtete, das zwar höfisch (oder womöglich "neuhöfisch") sein mochte, zu dem jedoch durchaus auch Bürgerliche zählen konnten: jene edelen herzen, die, ohne selbst zum Geburtsadel zu gehören, Gottfrieds Definition des neuen Kultur- und Gesellschaftsideals genügten.[14]

A close reading of the text, however, reveals that Gottfried's work is intended for those who can identify with the plight of Tristan and Isolde; for those who know that

---

[13] Gottfried von Straßburg, Tristan, 3rd ed in 3 Volumes, ed. and trans. Rüdiger Krohn (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1985) lines 45-54. All subsequent references to this work will appear in the text of the paper as Tristan with line numbers.

[14] Krohn 225. Cf. Dieter Seitz, Winfried Frey, and Walter Raitz, Einführung in die deutsche Literatur des 12. bis 16. Jahrhunderts, vol. 1 (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1979) 230. Seitz claims: "Der Autor apostrophiert ein Publikum, das andere Interessen hat als das typische Artusroman-Publikum. Ihn interessiert überhaupt das ganze ritterliche Brimborium herzlich wenig, er legt den Nachdruck auf die Darstellung psychischer Vorgänge." Cf. Cecil A. M. Noble, ed., "Gottfried von Straßburg's Tristan und Isolt-Courtly and Uncourtly," Cecil A. M. Noble: Spielbewußtsein. Essays zur deutschen Literatur und Sprache (Bern: Verlag Peter Lang AG, 1981) 87. Noble comments: "Here the poet strikes at the outset an uncourtly note in addressing himself specifically, not to the courtly society in general, but to the select group of edele herzen." Cf. Kurt Ruh, Höfische Epik des deutschen Mittelalters, vol. 2 (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1980) 228. Ruh concludes: "Dieses Modell gestattet auch, die höfische Gesellschaft schlechthin, ir aller werlt, und die edelen herzen nicht im Gegensatz, sondern in einem hierarchischen Verhältnis zu sehen." Cf. de Boor, Die höfische Literatur 135, who believes: "Nur der höfische Mensch ist fähig des edlen Herzens . . . "

true love and sorrow are inseparable. Nagel advances a similar view,

> Gottfried dichtet für eine Gemeinschaft erwählter Menschen, die die Identität von Liebe und Leid, Leben und Tod, Freude und Bitternis als eine Grundbefindlichkeit des menschlichen Daseins erfahren haben.[15]

The prologue in Gottfried's Tristan serves as one example of how critics may have been deceived by their assumptions regarding Gottfried's social status and the attitude of the bourgeoisie towards knights and knighthood. In the latter case, it has become clear in recent years that the bourgeoisie did not view knighthood and its adherents with disdain, but rather, used the knightly class for inspiration and, in many instances, patterned themselves and their lifestyle after that of the knights. Buschinger, for example, writes,

> Bis zum Ende des Mittelalters versuchten das städtische Patriziat und das gebildete Stadtbürgertum nicht, ein eigenes soziales und kulturelles Ideal aufzustellen, es blieb der ritterlichen Lebensart und Mentalität verbunden. Das Großbürgertum versuchte vielmehr, sich die Kultur des Adels anzueignen.[16]

---

[15] Bert Nagel, Staufische Klassik. Deutsche Dichtung um 1200 (Heidelberg: Lothar Stiehm Verlag, 1977) 105. Nagel adds: "Ein ideales Publikum kongenialer Leser schwebt dem Dichter vor, ein Publikum, das sich mit dem leidvollen Schicksal von Tristan und Isolt zu identifizieren vermag."

[16] Danielle Buschinger, "Das Bild des Kaufmanns im Tristan-Roman und bei Wolfram von Eschenbach," Zeitschrift für Germanistik (Leipzig) 8 (1987): 542. Cf. Krohn 219, who comments: "Das Patriziat der wirtschaftlich aufblühenden Handelsstädte, an Einfluß und Mitteln dem Rittertum zunehmend überlegen, nobilitierte sich durch die Übernahme von Versatzstücken feudaler Denk- und Lebensart." Cf. Horst P. Pütz, "Auf der Suche nach der Aventiure," AUGIAS 23 (1986): 19. Pütz mentions as well that the bourgeoisie even organized its own tournaments (18). Cf. Weber 91, who maintains: "Sowenig für das 13. Jh. die Kontrastierung von höfischer und bürgerlicher Dichtung und vollends die Konstruktion eines Antagonismus zwischen ihnen berechtigt ist, sowenig ist die

It becomes apparent, then, that many Tristan critics have unwittingly fallen victim to bias. They have attached the label of bourgeois to Gottfried and then apparently analyzed Tristan on the basis of a stereotype of the bourgeoisie (i.e. that their relationship with the knightly class was one of rivalry). To make matters worse, the stereotype that they used is a false one and not in agreement with the actual historical reality of medieval bourgeois life in Germany. And, finally, no certainty exists as to whether Gottfried actually did belong to the bourgeois class. In this regard, Krohn explains,

> Über Gottfrieds Stand und Beruf können wir - abermals nur Vermutungen anstellen. Mit einiger Verläßlichkeit läßt sich allerdings sagen, daß er nicht von Adel gewesen ist.[17]

It may be concluded, then, that analyzing Gottfried's Tristan with respect to a label attached to its author will not lead to a better (and unbiased) understanding of his work.

This chapter, then, will examine and re-evaluate Gottfried's conception of knighthood in Tristan by means of a close textual analysis. The various battle scenes involving Tristan as well as related text passages will be

---

Ineinsetzung von ritterlicher und höfischer Literatur." He points out as well that the bourgeois (or, more specifically, the clerici) wrote a considerable amount of courtly literature in the Middle Ages beginning with Chrétien de Troyes in France.

[17] Krohn 211. Cf. W. T. H. Jackson, The Anatomy of Love. The Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971) 31. Jackson argues: "To equate the title "Meister" [as in meister Gottfried] with the bourgeoisie is an error. The inhabitants of Strassburg were not a well-organized group of tradesmen and artisans at the end of the twelfth century. It is much more likely that "Meister" is to be understood in the sense of dominus, a man educated for the church but not necessarily in orders." Cf. Krohn 212-213, who observes: "Die Anrede galt aber ebenfalls für den, der sich in den septem artes liberales bewährt oder gar die akademische Würde eines magister (eingedeutscht zu meister) erworben hatte."

investigated. In addition, Tristan's development as a knight and his relationship to Marke's court will also be of interest to us. When appropriate, comparisons will be made between Tristan and Hartmann's Erec and Iwein in order to determine whether Gottfried's view of knighthood differs significantly from that of Hartmann. Lastly, the Tristram of Thomas of Brittany will also be used to establish whether possible deviations between Thomas' text and Gottfried's provide any further evidence as to what Gottfried's view of knighthood may have been.[18]

---

[18] Since the extant fragment of Thomas' work begins approximately where Gottfried's Tristan breaks off, reference will be made to Brother Robert's Old Norse translation of Thomas' text, which is available in an English prose version. It will be understood that whenever reference is made to Thomas or to his work that such reference is actually being made to Brother Robert's Saga. Paul Schach, trans., The Saga of Tristram and Isönd (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1973). All subsequent references to this work will appear in the text of the paper as Tristram with page numbers. The choice of Brother Robert's Saga as a substitute for Thomas' work is supported by most critics. Cf. Magda Heimerle, Gottfried und Thomas. Ein Vergleich (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Moritz Diesterweg, 1942) 9. She notes: "Die altnordische Prosaübersetzung, die Saga von Tristram ok Isond, bietet in ihrer oft wörtlichen Wiedergabe ein im Wesentlichen der Handlung getreues Bild der verlorenen Dichtung." Cf. Félix Piquet, L'originalité de Gottfried de Strasbourg dans son poème de Tristan et Isolde (Lille, France: l'université de Lille, 1905) 35. Piquet states: "La comparaison du poème français et de le Saga met en évidence le désir de Robert de respecter la physionomie de son original. Ses modifications sont en petit nombre et de peu en valeur." Cf. Constance B. Bouchard, "The Possible Nonexistence of Thomas, Author of Tristan and Isolde," Modern Philology 79 (1981): 71. Bouchard stands alone in her view that Gottfried may not have used Thomas as his source. She even goes so far as to say: "It seems entirely reasonable to conclude that there was no real Thomas, or, if there was, his work is almost entirely lost. The original French author of the story of Tristan and Isolde (who might indeed have been named Thomas) would nevertheless not have written any of the extant "Thomas" materials with the possible exception of the small Cambridge fragment, and certainly not the elaborate ending of the story found in the other so-called Thomas

A. Riwalin

After the prologue, Gottfried relates to us the life of Riwalin Canêlangres (Tristan's father). Riwalin is described as being an exemplary knight in all respects save one. His youthful arrogance causes him to throw caution to the wind (Tristan 245-71).[19]

The truth of this assertion is soon made evident as Riwalin begins to wage war on his liege lord, Duke Morgan, for no apparent reason (Tristan 342-46).[20] Although Duke Morgan and his followers attempt to ward off the attack, their efforts prove futile. To spare his land from further devastation at the hands of Riwalin and his men, Duke Morgan hastily arranges a truce of one year's duration (Tristan 392-401). A comparison of this scene with the corresponding one in Thomas' Tristram reveals a number of important changes.

---

fragments. These were rather written, a generation or two later, by an author imbued with thirteen-century courtly concepts who felt an ending was needed for the original poem." Bouchard's view, however provocative it may be, is one that must be rejected, since it is based almost entirely upon speculation.

[19] Cf. Michael S. Batts, Gottfried von Straßburg (New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1971) 45. Batts states: "Gottfried portrays Riwalin as a model knight. Although still a youth, he possesses all the virtues traditionally assigned to the perfect nobleman: beauty, loyalty, generosity, charity, and so forth. His one weakness is his strong desire for adventure and his rash and unpremeditated actions."

[20] Cf. Seitz 255, who says the following regarding Gottfried's description of this scene: "Ganz nüchtern und desillusioniert und überdies sehr knapp wird dies bei Gottfried geschildert. Er arbeitet nicht den Glanz ritterlicher Taten, sondern den Schematismus feudaler Fehden aus." Seitz errs here on two counts. Firstly, Gottfried should not be expected to provide a lengthy description of Riwalin's feud when it is clear that he does not approve of his actions. Secondly, he must follow his source in describing the feud and not try to pass it off as a glorious knightly accomplishment.

Firstly, in Thomas' version Riwalin's counterpart, Kanelangres, is unconditionally praised for being a brave knight who is said to be "wise and prudent in his plans, foresighted and foreseeing . . . . " (Tristram 3) While Gottfried also duly notes Riwalin's good qualities, he, however, faults him for being too reckless (Tristan 269-71). In this respect, it is important to bear in mind that Gottfried explains Riwalin's recklessness by making numerous explicit references to his youth (Tristan 245-46, 265-68, 293-304, 337), whereas Thomas only refers to Kanelangres' youth twice (Tristram 3), but never expressly states that his youth has any bearing on his actions as a knight.[21] Secondly, Thomas has Kanelangres wage war on an unnamed king (Tristram 3), whereas Gottfried has Riwalin do likewise on Duke Morgan (Tristan 345). And, lastly, though both poets mention the arrangement of a truce, Gottfried expressly states that it is in effect for one year only (Tristan 398). As will become apparent during this analysis, these latter two changes will have important consequences for both Riwalin and Tristan later in the narrative.

It is at this point that Riwalin decides to embark on a journey to the court of King Marke, whose personal reputation has spread far beyond the borders of his court at Cornwall (Tristan 420-26, 450-54). This time, however, Riwalin does not seek strife, but rather, knowledge and refinement:

---

[21] Cf. Heimerle 19, who observes: "Aus gewandeltem Lebensgefühl heraus hat der deutsche Dichter . . . die Macht- und Eroberungszüge des französischen Helden getilgt. Er vermag in solchen Unternehmungen keinen Beweis löblichen und hochgesinnten Strebens mehr zu erblicken. Jene Spur von selbstischer Eroberernatur, die Riwalin vom französischen Urbild ererbt, da in solcher Veranlagung der Angriff auf Morgan begründet ist, sucht er durch die Schilderung der blüenden jugent entschuldigend zu erklären . . . ." She adds that Gottfried's rejection of Riwalin's recklessness is due to the fact that Gottfried belonged to an age "zu der Mitleid und Erbarmen höchste Erfüllung höfischer Humanität bedeuten . . . . "

aldâ dâhte er belîben,
ein jâr mit ime vertrîben
und von im werden tugenthaft
und lernen niuwan ritterschaft
und ebenen sîne site baz. (Tristan 455-59)

After entrusting his lands to his marshal, Rual li Foitenant, Riwalin travels with twelve companions to Cornwall (Tristan 465-71). Interestingly enough, Thomas has Kanelangres take twenty knights with him and also makes a point of praising them for their knightly accoutrements:

> They were magnificently equipped with excellent weapons, strong armor, and splendid steeds, and thus they came to England, landing in Cornwall. (Tristram 4)

Gottfried, on the other hand, mentions only that Riwalin and his companions (we may assume that they are also knights, although Gottfried tones down their knightly status by referring to them as gesellen) were finely attired:

sich und die sîne cleite er dô
rîlîche und alse im wol gezam. (Tristan 482-83)

This minor deviation from his source may perhaps be due to Gottfried's desire to stress that Riwalin's intentions are peaceful, since Thomas appears to place less emphasis on Kanelangres' need for refinement and more on his desire for combat as this excerpt from Tristram illustrates:

> So, too, he wished to observe their manner of life, their habits and customs, and to test and try their might and their weapons and their prowess in knightly games [my emphasis]. (Tristram 4)

In addition, Kanelangres does not mention his desire to acquaint himself with courtly customs until he speaks to King Markis at his court (Tristram 5), whereas Riwalin is said to have had this intention before he left for King Marke's court (Tristan 455-59).

Gottfried's deviation, subtle though it may be, enhances the perception of Riwalin that he wants us to have. Riwalin's actions are those of a knight who realizes, perhaps only at a subconscious level, that the knighthood he practises is

imperfect and in need of refinement. That this is indeed the case is hinted at by Gottfried when he states that Riwalin wanted to learn niuwan ritterschaft and ebenen sîne site baz (Tristan 458 and 459).

A comparison of Riwalin with his counterpart, Kanelangres, provides further support for our view of Riwalin. Kanelangres is said to want to observe the people in Cornwall and "try their might and their weapons and their prowess in knightly games" (Tristram 4). No mention is ever made of his wanting to improve himself. Thus, when he arrives at King Markis' court, Kanelangres is only able to continue engaging in the same type of knighthood as he did before, whereas Riwalin appears willing to learn from those at King Marke's court. It follows, then, that Kanelangres' comments to King Markis (Tristram 5) lack the sincerity of Riwalin's conversation with King Marke (Tristan 502-03).

Riwalin's decision to travel to King Marke's court turns out to have been a good idea, since he soon finds himself winning the praises of everyone at court:

> Canêlangres der was dâ wol
> des hoves, der hof der was sîn vol.
> arme und rîche haeten in
> liep unde werden under in
> und enwart nie gast geminnet baz.
> (Tristan 509-13)

His crowning glory, however, occurs some time later as King Marke makes preparations for his annual festival (Tristan 520-32). Competing against knights who have come from all over England, Riwalin proves to be the best knight present and easily outshines the other knights in the bohort:

> swaz aber von ieman dâ geschach,
> sô was der höfische Riwalîn
> und muose ez ouch binamen sîn,
> der ez des tages und an der stete
> ze wunsche vor in allen tete.
> ouch nâmen sîn die vrouwen war
> und jâhen des, daz in der schar
> nieman nâch ritterlîchem site
> alsô behendeclîchen rite,

und lobeten elliu sîniu dinc. (Tristan 694-703)

Among the many ladies at court who praise him is also the sister of King Marke, the lovely Blanscheflur. Like them, she finds herself attracted to Riwalin. In her case, however, this attraction represents the early stages of love, for as Gottfried observes,

> sî haete in in ir muot genomen,
> er was ir in ir herze komen;
> er truoc gewalteclîche
> in ir herzen künecrîche
> den cepter und die crône:
> daz sî doch alsô schône
> und alsô tougenlîchen hal,
> daz sî'z in allen vor verstal. (Tristan 725-32)

The two finally meet and Gottfried describes at great length the blossoming of this love and the effects it has on both of them: inner confusion, then longing for one another and, finally, the pain of being apart (Tristan 790-1023). As one would expect from Gottfried's comments in the prologue, the pain of love is continually stressed (Tristan 824-27, 859-67, 929-36, 972-93). The following comment on how Riwalin is affected by this love is typical:

> Nu daz diu süeze minne
> sîn herze und sîne sinne
> al nâch ir willen haete braht,
> dannoch was ime vil ungedâht,
> daz herzeliebe waere
> sô nâhe gênde ein swaere. (Tristan 915-20)

As Riwalin and Blanscheflur are said to be engulfed in the flames of love, Marke's festival comes to an end and his guests depart (Tristan 1111-20). At this point Marke is informed that an unnamed enemy king has entered his kingdom intending to plunder and destroy in much the same way that Riwalin had earlier in Duke Morgan's land (Tristan 1121-27). In response, Marke assembles a small army and rides out to defend his kingdom:

> er vaht mit ime und sigete im an
> und sluog und vienc sô manegen man,
> daz ez von grôzen saelden was,
> der dannen kam oder dâ genas. (Tristan 1131-34)

Marke emerges victorious, but Riwalin is not so fortunate. He receives an apparently fatal spear wound to the side and is brought back to court amidst much sadness (Tristan 1135-62).

This lacklustre battle scene has attracted the attention of de Boor who observes:

> Man beachte . . . das gewollte Mißverhältnis zwischen der berauschenden Festschilderung mit ihren über 500 Verszeilen und der nichtssagenden Kriegschilderung von 16 Zeilen (1119-1134). Man beachte die bewußte Lässigkeit, die Markes Feind nicht einmal einen Namen gönnt - ein sîn vient, sagt Gottfried - und sich in der eigentlichen Schlachtschilderung auf die eine Zeile beschränkt: er vaht mit ime und sigete im an.[22]

And, Goldschmidt Kunzer adds:

> The entire war episode is used solely to bring to fruition the love affair between Blancheflur and the now wounded warrior Riwalin.[23]

It would appear, then, that this battle serves only to bring about Riwalin's injury so that it, in turn, will act as a catalyst in bringing Riwalin and Blanscheflur together, who up until now have only exchanged glances.

A comparison of this battle with the corresponding one in Gottfried's source, however, reveals an interesting alteration which may help to explain its brevity. Thomas has Kanelangres receive his life-threatening injury in a tournament, which he describes as follows:

> This tournament ended with many a chivalrous knight killed or wounded, and a host of them taken captive. (Tristram 14)

This description parallels that given in Tristan of the battle to defend King Marke's kingdom (cf. Tristan 1131-34). Thus, the two scenes are virtually identical save for the fact that Kanelangres fights and is injured in a tournament

---

[22] de Boor, "Die Grundauffassung von Gottfrieds Tristan," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 18 (1940): 277.

[23] Goldschmidt Kunzer 47.

whereas Riwalin does so in a battle which can be likened to a war.

Now, if the battle Gottfried describes is supposed to serve only to provide the injury that will bring him and Blanscheflur together--which we believe it does--the question must be addressed as to why Gottfried felt compelled to place the battle within the context of a war rather than within that of a tournament. A possible explanation lies in the evolution of the tournament in medieval times. Pütz' research into the tournament reveals that it was a bloody affair which frequently resulted in injuries and even deaths among the participants.[24] This situation remained essentially unchanged until the beginning of the 13th century as Pütz informs us:

> Auch scheinen nicht nur im Eifer des Gefechts scharfe statt stumpfer Waffen verwendet worden, . . . sondern die Einführung fester Turnierregeln, die Verwendung abgestumpfter Waffen und die Teilnahme von adligen Damen als Zuschauerinnen werden erst frühestens nach der Wende zum 13. Jahrhundert allmählich in den Quellen greifbar.[25]

Since Thomas' Tristram is generally thought to have been written circa 1170,[26] and Gottfried's Tristan circa 1210,[27] it is quite possible that their respective depictions of the same scene reflect a difference in the practices associated with the tournament as well as a change in contemporary tastes. It is not difficult to imagine

---

[24] Pütz 9. He mentions, for example, a tournament held in 1175 at which "16 Ritter umgekommen waren und schließlich auch ein Sohn des Markgrafen Dietrich von der Lausitz . . . " which resulted in a certain Archbishop Wichmann von Seeburg's excommunicating all of the tournament participants and refusing Christian burial for those killed.

[25] Pütz 9-10.

[26] Weber 52.

[27] Weber 53. Cf. Krohn 230.

Thomas' description of a tournament at which many knights lose their lives at Kanelangres' hands (Tristram 14) as being perfectly acceptable in 1170 when such occurrences actually did take place on a regular basis. Furthermore, it is also understandable that some forty years later, after the introduction of tournament rules designed to prevent loss of life, Gottfried would not be able to depict a tournament at which a knight is praised for having killed other knights. Thus, he is left with a dilemma. The narrative requires that Riwalin be seriously injured in order to set the love between him and Blanscheflur in motion and, yet, Gottfried cannot use the tournament to bring about the injury, since to do so would result in the depiction of a tournament which violates the tournament rules in existence at Gottfried's time. Gottfried then--we believe--did the only thing he could do in order to remain true to his source and to satisfy his penchant for realism: the tournament was transformed into a war scene. In this way, Gottfried could depict the death of many knights and have Riwalin receive the all-important wound, thereby leaving the narrative relatively intact and avoiding the depiction of a tournament which would have been an unrealistic depiction of the tournament as it existed at Gottfried's time.

After learning of Riwalin's injury, Blanscheflur manages to rendezvous with him in his room. It is there that the two finally consummate their love for one another, which results in Blanscheflur's pregnancy. In the meantime, Riwalin recovers from his wounds thanks to God's intervention (Tristan 1322-30).

His post-recovery period turns out to be a time of bliss for both him and Blanscheflur, since they are able to enjoy each other's company and devote themselves entirely to each other. Their happiness is shortlived, however, for Riwalin receives word that Duke Morgan has entered his kingdom with

a large army (Tristan 1374-79).[28]

As Riwalin prepares to return home, Blanscheflur bares her soul to him, revealing that she is expecting his child (Tristan 1466-68). In addition, she reveals her fear of either being killed or disowned by Marke once he learns that she is pregnant (Tristan 1469-1503). Thus, arrangements are made to have her secretly brought aboard Riwalin's ship, and, later that same evening Riwalin sets sail for home after having bidden Marke farewell (Tristan 1559-84).

Upon his arrival home, Riwalin meets with marshal Rual and informs him of what has transpired at Marke's court. Rual then advises him to repay Blanscheflur for the kindness she showed him by marrying her, and, hence, a short time later a marriage takes place (Tristan 1628-37).[29]

After Rual hides Blanscheflur away in a safe place, he and Riwalin prepare for the battle with Duke Morgan. Riwalin's followers are alerted and an army is soon assembled (Tristan 1660-65). As in Riwalin's previous battles, Gottfried does not describe the battle in any detail except to say,

> ouch wart ir harte wol gebiten
> von Morgane und von den sînen:
> sî enpfiengen Riwalînen

---

[28] One will recall that Riwalin and Morgan had previously agreed to a truce of one year's duration (Tristan 398). Presumably, then, a year has passed since the two men last met, and their truce is now officially over.

[29] Cf. Jackson, The Anatomy of Love 69. He states: "The reason that Riwalin does not take the obvious step of asking for the hand of Mark's sister is that he knew that the marriage of a king's sister was a political matter and that he could hardly expect Mark to give away his most important asset to a minor foreign ruler, merely because she happened to love him. So we have the ritual, the secret love, and finally the marriage which is performed to make an honest woman of Blanscheflur." While Jackson's point is well-taken, it is troubling, however, that once Riwalin and Blanscheflur return to his kingdom that it is not he, but rather Rual who suggests that a marriage would be in order.

mit einer harten vehte.
hei waz dâ guoter knehte
gevellet unde geveiget wart!
wie lützel der dâ wart gespart!
wie manic man kam dâ ze nôt,
und wie vil maneger lac dâ tôt
und wunt von ietwederm her. (Tristan 1666-75)

In this respect, however, it must be noted that Thomas' description of the corresponding scene is also not very detailed (Tristram 18).

Riwalin dies in battle, and Gottfried, in an apparent addition to his source, states the following with respect to Riwalin:

Canêlangres der guote,
der ritterlichem muote
noch hêrren tugende an keiner stete
nie vuoz noch halben wanc getete,
der lac dâ jaemerlîchen tôt. (Tristan 1681-85)

This praise of Riwalin's alleged unwavering knightly conviction (i.e. ritterlicher muot) must be viewed as ironic, when one recalls his first battle, which was an unchivalrous act of aggression carried out because of--as Gottfried tells us--either necessity or recklessness (Tristan 342-43).[30] However, Gottfried's comment just prior to this one relating the fact that Riwalin had land and vassals (i.e. everything needed to wage war) suggests that he was motivated by recklessness rather than by necessity (Tristan 340-41). His subsequent battles give us little indication of whether his actions in battle are chivalrous or unchivalrous. One exception is his participation in the bohort/tournament at Marke's court where he is indeed praised for his knightly prowess (Tristan 699-703). It is interesting to note, however, that while five verses are devoted to praising his knightly virtues, fourteen verses are devoted to praising his appearance (Tristan 706-19). Thus, his good looks appear to

---

[30] Cf. Batts 78, who believes: "Gottfried disposes of him somewhat cynically, indicating by the manner in which his demise is portrayed that this was no very great loss . . . "

be more important than his skill as a knight.

Despite the fact that Gottfried gives us little detail about Riwalin's knightly behaviour (e.g. Does he ever show mercy?), we can make some general comments about the knighthood he represents. W. T. H. Jackson, for instance, has the following to say about Riwalin's role as a knight:

> He is the happy, worldly knight rejected by Gottfried in his prologue, at least so far as the courtly audience which sees him is concerned.[31]

Jackson's belief that Riwalin represents the worldly knight is a possibility especially in light of the fact that ir aller werlde is described in similar terms as is Riwalin's propensity to be reckless (cf. Tristan 53, 310). It must also be noted, however, that Gottfried also uses the term edelez herze when referring to Riwalin (cf. Tristan 460). If indeed Gottfried intends Riwalin's downfall to be symbolic of that of the worldly knight, we must ask if he is thereby rejecting knighthood per se.

Again, a comparison with Gottfried's source may help to shed some light on this problem. As we stated earlier, Gottfried has made a number of minor changes to his source with repect to knighthood. Riwalin invades Duke Morgan's territory, whereas Kanelangres invades that of an unnamed king. Then, later, Riwalin is forced to leave Marke's kingdom and return home when Duke Morgan arrives with an army--presumably to reclaim that which was taken from him--whereas Kanelangres returns home when a group of Bretons--again unnamed--begins to pillage in his kingdom (cf. Tristram 16). It is apparent, then, that Thomas' work contains two

---

[31] W. T. H. Jackson, "Tristan the Artist in Gottfried's Poem," Publications of the Modern Language Association 77 (1962): 366. Cf. Heimerle 19. She states: "Thomas [in his Tristram] zeichnet in Rivalen [Kanelangres] den Typus des diesseitsgestimmten, ichbetonten Ritters, ein Wunschbild, in dem Tapferkeit und Tatkraft die hervorragendsten Eigenschaften sind." She notes as well that this is the type of knight that Gottfried rejects in his Tristan.

unrelated scenes which, due to Gottfried's minor changes, now become two related scenes. The purpose of this alteration is twofold. Firstly, it improves the narrative by explaining Tristan's later accusation levelled at Duke Morgan that he had killed his father (Tristan 5425-27). Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the linking of the two scenes results in Riwalin's being hoisted with his own petard so to speak. Riwalin had for no apparent reason waged war on Duke Morgan, his liege lord, in the first scene and then in the second scene he finds himself on the receiving end of Duke Morgan's wrath.[32]

If, in addition, we also consider the type of battles in which Riwalin engaged (i.e. such as the first battle with Duke Morgan), it becomes clear that they have no connection with the courtly battles that we encountered in Hartmann's Erec and Iwein, and yet Erec and Iwein could also be considered to be worldly knights (at least compared to someone like Parzival who becomes King of the Grail). The battles in which Riwalin participates appear (with the notable exception of the tournament at which he wins praise) to be pre-courtly battles, that is to say, battles which are part of the Germanic world. One indication of this is the fact that these battles are not courtly duels, as was the case in Erec and Iwein, but rather all-out wars, involving looting and pillaging (cf. Tristan 347-75). Another is the fact that Riwalin in the beginning is not associated with any court as a courtly knight would be. And, lastly, he expresses a need to visit a court and learn niuwe ritterschaft (Tristan 454-64), whereas his counterpart, Kanelangres, appears more

---

[32] Cf. Otto Langer, "Der Künstlerroman Gottfrieds - Protest bürgerlicher Empfindsamkeit gegen höfisches Tugendsystem?" Euphorion 68 (1974): 13. He states: " . . . durch die Tötung Riwalins hat Morgan . . . auf das Recht auf Unverletzlichkeit des Lebens verstoßen . . . " Langer fails to realize, however, that Morgan is simply trying to regain the land Riwalin stole from him in the first place.

intent on challenging the knights of Markis' court than on improving his knighthood or learning courtliness (Tristram 4 and 5). Thus, at this point in the analysis, it appears that Gottfried does not reject knighthood per se, but rather the type of knighthood that Riwalin practices--a knighthood which we could describe as pre-courtly.

This pre-courtly world to which Riwalin and Blanscheflur belong has, then, according to Haug, a very important function:

> Die Vorgeschichte besitzt zudem die Funktion, die Gesetzlichkeit der Welt zu demonstrieren, in der auch Tristan und Isolt sich werden bewegen müssen, aber, und das ist der Grund der Vorwegnahme, diese Gesetzlichkeit wird sich nur als eine allgemeine Basis erweisen, von der aus sich unter bestimmten Bedingungen neue Möglichkeiten eröffnen: Tristan wird ein Riwalin auf höherer Stufe sein [my emphasis].[33]

Although Haug refers primarily to the love aspect of Tristan, we believe that his statement may also be applied with respect to Tristan's knighthood. As will become evident during the course of this analysis, Tristan will surpass his father not only with respect to courtliness, but also with respect to knighthood. Although, he--like his father--will also be found, at times, to be wanting in terms of chivalrousness, his battles take place, for the most part, in the courtly world (i.e. they are duels rather than wars with the exception of Arundel), rather than in the pre-courtly world. In addition, when Tristan does engage in battle, he appears to do so not because of übermuot (cf. Tristan 342), but rather, because he has some specific goal in mind which can only be achieved through confrontation.

B. Rual li Foitenant

Before discussing Tristan, a few words should be said

---

[33] Walter Haug, "âventiure in Gottfrieds von Straßburg Tristan," Festschrift für Hans Eggers, ed. Herbert Backes (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1972) 99.

about his foster father, Rual li Foitenant. In contrast to Tristan's father, Riwalin, Rual appears to be a very level-headed knight. Although he appears only once in battle (cf. Tristan 5557-5608), the general impression one has of him is that of an exemplary knight. Throughout the narrative, Rual's actions and Gottfried's comments concerning them convey an impression of a loyal and steadfast knight (cf. Tristan 1594-96). Firstly, it is he to whom Riwalin entrusts his land when departing for King Marke's court, because, as Gottfried tells us, he is a man an dem man triuwe erkande (Tristan 468, cf. 1590). Secondly, Riwalin turns to him for advice upon his return from King Marke's court and is told that he should marry Blanscheflur--a decision which he should have been able to make on his own (Tristan 1620-37). And, lastly, he assumes the responsibility of caring for young Tristan when Blanscheflur dies shortly after giving birth (Tristan 1743-50).

It is this last action which proves to be most important with respect to Tristan's future "development" as a man and as a knight, for Rual, in his role as foster father, determines the education that young Tristan is to receive; an education that will set him apart from his father with respect to both courtliness and knighthood.

C. Tristan's Early Life

Before young Tristan may receive his education, however, the state of war between Duke Morgan and the now-deceased Riwalin must be brought to an end. Here again, it is Riwalin's marshal, Rual li Foitenant, who plays a decisive role. Realizing that a protracted battle would not be in his best interests, he meets with the other noblemen in Riwalin's land and convinces them that their only option is to surrender to Duke Morgan and to place themselves (along with their land and subjects) at his mercy (Tristan 1879-93).

With hostilities at an end, Rual returns home and orders his wife, Floraete, on pain of death to feign pregnancy

(Tristan 1894-1903). After an appropriate length of time, the son of Riwalin and Blanscheflur--who the world believes died with his mother (Tristan 1823-29)--is brought to Floraete and henceforth raised as her own son (Tristan 1926-32). A short time later, he is christened and given the name Tristan because of the tragic circumstances of his birth (Tristan 1991-2005).[34]

Rual's actions with respect to young Tristan--which Gottfried attributes to his strong sense of loyalty to Riwalin (Tristan 2023-41)--serve first and foremost to spare the boy possible death at the hands of his father's enemy, since the narrative obviously requires that Tristan be allowed to reach adulthood. Secondly, and perhaps equally importantly, his actions result in a shift of focus away from the tragedy of Riwalin's demise and to the education of Tristan. In this way, the reader is alerted not only to Gottfried's desire to distance Tristan's life and education as much as possible from the life and experiences of his father, Riwalin, but also to the important role that this education will play in Tristan's future "development" (as a man and as a knight). Lastly, Rual's intervention (i. e. raising Tristan as his own son) also changes the character of the education that young Tristan is to receive. Instead of growing up with the knowledge of who his true father is and how he died, Tristan is afforded the luxury of believing that faithful Rual is his father. Thus, he is unencumbered by thoughts of avenging his father's death until much later in the narrative and permitted to concentrate exclusively upon

---

[34] Although both Gottfried and Thomas (cf. Tristram 19f.) claim that the protagonist's name is a derivation of the French word for sad--triste--, Weber traces the origin of the name back to an historical figure: Drust, son of King Talorc (a king of the Picts at the end of the 8th century). Thus, Gottfried's and Thomas' respective attempts to link the hero's name to the tragic loss of his parents appear to be based on false etymology. Weber 32.

his education. Had he, however, been aware of his background during his formative years, it is quite likely that feelings of revenge might have led him to modify his education by focusing solely upon the acquisition of skills related to doing battle. It follows, then, that such a modification to his education would also have resulted in a change in the character of Tristan's later knighthood, culminating in his becoming simply a younger version of his father. Due to Rual's intervention, however, the course that Tristan's knighthood is to take is irrevocably altered and allowed to deviate from that of his father. Therefore, to begin to understand the type of knighthood which Tristan will practise and, as well, how it relates to Gottfried's conception of knighthood, it is necessary to begin with an examination of the education that Tristan receives.[35]

1. Education

Tristan's formal education begins at the age of seven when his foster father Rual places him in the care of an unnamed wise man with whom Tristan is sent abroad to learn foreign languages (Tristan 2056-63). During this time, Tristan learns how to read, and Gottfried makes a point of stressing that Tristan was obliged to devote the majority of his time to this endeavour (Tristan 2064-67).

Despite the loss of freedom associated with his studies--of which Gottfried does not hesitate to remind his reader (Tristan 2068-86)--Tristan dedicates himself to his studies to such an extent that he succeeds in reading more books in a short space of time than any child before him or since (Tristan 2087-92). In addition, he is said to spend a considerable portion of each day learning to play all kinds of stringed instruments which he soon masters (Tristan 2093-

---

[35] Cf. Cosman 9, who adds: "For Thomas of Britain's Tristan and for Gottfried von Strassburg, who claims Thomas as his source, the hero's education in the enfance bears a crucial relationship to the later parts of the narratives."

99).

Tristan also receives a knightly education which consists of instruction in riding with a shield and spear, maneuvering a horse in knightly fashion, fencing, fighting, running, jumping, and, lastly, throwing the spear (Tristan 2103-16). As well, he learns the art of stalking and hunting wild game, and is said to be well-versed in the various courtly games (Tristan 2117-22).

A number of critics have pointed out that Gottfried on the whole appears to place a great deal of emphasis upon Tristan's intellectual pursuits and very little upon his knightly ones. One such critic is Noble, who states,

> There are . . . aspects of the poem which should not be ignored. One of the most important of these is its intellectualism, a definite and intentional shift of emphasis from the physical aspects of knightly prowess to those of the mind and spirit.[36]

A cursory examination of the text would seem to support this contention. Tristan's acquisition of skills proceeds in the following order: 1. books/foreign languages; 2. stringed instruments; 3. knightly pursuits; 4. stalking/hunting; and 5. courtly games. In addition, the reader is told that Tristan was required to spend most of his time engaged in the study of books (i.e. vor aller slahte lêre, Tristan 2067). Thus, it would appear at first glance that Gottfried favours intellectual endeavours over knightly ones, by downplaying the latter and emphasizing the former.

---

[36] Cecil A. M. Noble, "Gottfried von Straßburg's Tristan und Isolt - Courtly and Uncourtly," Cecil A. M. Noble: Spielbewußtsein. Essays zur deutschen Literatur und Sprache (Bern: Verlag Peter Lang AG, 1981) 91. Cf. Goldschmidt Kunzer 88, who observes: "In Tristan the greatest emphasis is placed on the arts, on intellectual and artistic accomplishments, while the purely physical aspects of chivalry - though their perfection, too, is taken for granted in the hero-are treated with ironic disdain . . . "

A closer examination of Gottfried's description of Tristan's education, however, suggests that such a view may not be entirely justified. Firstly, Gottfried's choice of prepositions used to list the various skills which Tristan must acquire suggests that the order in which these skills appear in the text is not necessarily Gottfried's order of preference. In this connection, it is helpful to look at Gottfried's description of Tristan's knightly education as it appears in the text:

> er lernete alle stunde
> hiute diz, morgen daz,
> hiure wol, ze jâre baz.
> über diz allez lernet er [my emphasis]
> mit dem schilte und mit dem sper
> behendeclîche rîten,
> daz ors ze beiden sîten
> bescheidenlîche rüeren,
> von sprunge ez vreche vüeren,
> turnieren und leisieren,
> mit schenkeln sambelieren
> rehte und nâch ritterlîchem site. (Tristan 2100-11)

Gottfried uses the Middle High German preposition über which--like its New High German counterpart--may mean "over, above, beyond, [or] more than . . . ."[37] The preposition über governs the phrase diz allez (i.e. all this) which, owing to its general nature, must refer back to an antecedent. The closest antecedent happens to be diz (i.e. this) and daz (i.e. that) which, in turn, refer back to Tristan's education up to this point in the text. Thus, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the phrase über diz allez lernet er (Tristan: line 2103), whose approximate translation is above all this he learned,[38] both refers back to and subordinates

---

[37] Herbert Lederer, Reference Grammar of the German Language (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969) 392. Cf. Matthias Lexer, Mittelhochdeutsche Taschenwörterbuch, 37th ed. (Stuttgart: S. Hirzel Verlag, 1983) 236.

[38] The translation offered is my own. It is interesting to note that some critics have suggested translations of this line which may be misleading. Krohn, for example, translates

Tristan's previous educational endeavours (i.e. books/foreign languages and stringed instruments) to the study of knighthood. In addition, the fact that Gottfried appears to have already subordinated the study of stringed instruments to that of books/foreign languages (cf. Tristan 2093-96) by his use of the Middle High German preposition under, which--like its New High German counterpart (i.e. unter)--may mean "under, below, beneath, [or] less than , . . ."[39] seems to support the contention that Gottfried's use of the preposition über is intended to make the study of knighthood superordinate to Tristan's other studies, including the study of books.

Secondly, Gottfried's comments concerning Tristan's education indicate as well that the order in which Tristan's newly-acquired skills are listed is not identical to their order of importance. Although Gottfried does mention the study of books first and does tell his readers that this endeavour occupied most of Tristan's time, he also at the same time bemoans the fact that the study of books caused Tristan to worry and robbed him of his freedom (Tristan 2083-86, cf. 2068-82). In marked contrast to this comment, Gottfried notes that Tristan often enjoyed engaging in knightly activities (i.e. hie bankete er sich oft mite.

---

the line as follows: "Daneben lernte er" (i.e. "Besides this he learned") and Hatto in much the same way: "In addition to all this he learned . . . ." Thus, both translators, in our opinion, alter Gottfried's intended meaning and thereby diminish the importance of line 2103 as well as of the passage that follows it. Rüdiger Krohn, ed. and trans., Tristan, 3rd ed, vol. 1 (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1984), 2103. A. T. Hatto, trans., Tristan. With the 'Tristram' of Thomas (Markham: Penguin Books Canada Limited, 1985) 69.

[39] Lederer 397. Cf. Lexer 247.

[Tristan 2112]).[40] Since Tristan is happy when learning about knighthood and sorrowful when reading his books, it follows that for Tristan--and perhaps for Gottfried as well--knighthood takes precedence over the study of books.

Lastly, a comparison of Gottfried's Tristan with that of his source, Thomas, results in a similar conclusion. While the order of skills to be acquired by both Gottfried's Tristan and Thomas' Tristram are very similar, there are a few important differences. Gottfried's disparaging comments made about the study of books do not appear in Thomas' work. Thomas states only that Tristram "was most eager to learn" (Tristram 20). As well, Gottfried's entire description of Tristan's knightly education (Tristan 2103-16) is not present in Thomas' Tristram. Thomas mentions only that "no one was more highly endowed than [Tristram] in . . . valor" (Tristram 20). Except for this sole reference, Thomas gives no indication that Tristram even receives a knightly education.

In light of these observations, it becomes apparent that Gottfried does not, as Noble has suggested,[41] stress the primacy of intellectual abilities over knightly ones. On the contrary, Gottfried's treatment of the knightly component of Tristan's education indicates that he appears to view knighthood more favourably than he does the other more intellectual aspects of Tristan's education such as the study of books and languages. This is underscored by the fact that Gottfried--in an apparent deviation from his source--greatly expands the description of Tristan's knightly education originally found in Thomas.

---

[40] Lexer 9, defines the Middle High German verb sich baneken as follows: "sich durch bewegung [sic] erlustigen . . . ."

[41] See Footnote #36.

By virtue of his education, then, Gottfried's Tristan is more familiar with the tenets of knighthood than is his counterpart, Tristram, and, consequently, Tristan may be said to be more skilled as a knight as well. This is not to say, however, that the remainder of his education is without importance. In contrast to Thomas, who appears to simply provide a list of the skills which Tristram acquires and then praises him (Tristram 20), Gottfried gives his reader some insight into the difficulty involved in mastering as many skills as young Tristan does by frequently noting Tristan's diligence (Tristan 2070-73, 2087-92, 2093-99). Gottfried's penchant for greater realism than Thomas results in his Tristan being a more believeable character than Thomas' Tristram. Whereas Tristram appears to be a Wunderkind who makes mastery of various skills appear ridiculously easy, Tristan is more like a real person whose hard work combined with natural ability enable him to excell in a number of areas. In addition, as will become evident during the course of this analysis, all of the skills acquired by Tristan during this period have some bearing on his future encounters with others, whereas the same cannot always be said of Tristram.

2. Life at Court

Tristan spends his time at King Marke's court impressing the people there with his prowess in such courtly activities as stalking/hunting, harp playing, and singing/speaking in a number of foreign languages (Tristan 2759-3730). These activities, which serve to highlight Tristan's exemplary education, initially appear to have little or no relation to knighthood. However, a comparison with Hartmann's Erec, a work which begins with King Arthur and his knights participating in a hunt for the White Stag, suggests that hunting seems to occupy a good deal of a knight's time and may therefore be considered at the very least an important

knightly pastime.[42] This is supported by the fact that, though King Marke praises Tristan for all of his abilities (i.e. hunting, foreign languages, and the playing of stringed instruments [Tristan 3722-24]), he presents him with gifts related to only one of the abilities: hunting [the various gifts include clothing, a sword, spurs, a crossbow, and a golden horn (Tristan: lines 3732-3739)].

Some time later after Rual arrives at and is welcomed by the court, he advises his foster son, Tristan, to ask King Marke to help him become a knight so that he might return home to get his affairs in order (Tristan 4387-95). Tristan does not follow his advice immediately, however, but instead, hesitates until King Marke asks him whether he would like to become a knight and attempts to convince him that he would be provided with the financial wherewithal required for whatever his future goals might be (Tristan: lines 4401-88).

Unlike his counterpart, Tristram (cf. Tristram 33), Tristan does not of his own volition ask King Marke to be dubbed a knight. This fact has attracted the attention of a number of critics, who have attempted to provide a possible explanation for the apparent difference in attitude between Tristan and his counterpart. One such critic is Heimerle, who attributes the difference in attitude to Gottfried's desire to portray a more youthful protagonist:

> Der französische Tristan fordert nach der Erzählung vom Geschick seiner Eltern gleichsam als innerlich reifer Mensch, daß Marke ihn zum Ritter schlage, um den KAMPF MIT MORGAN [sic] aufnehmen

---

[42] Cf. Helmut Brackert, ed. and trans., Das Nibelungenlied. 1. Teil. Mittelhochdeutscher Text und Übertragung (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH, 1986) strophes 916-991. The murder of Siegfried by Hagen von Tronje takes place while the two knights are on a hunt. Cf. Hannes Kästner, Harfe und Schwert. Der höfische Spielmann bei Gottfried von Straßburg (Tübingen: Niemeyer Verlag, 1981) 50. Kästner notes: "Die Jagd war ein priviligiertes Vergnügen des Adels und eine seiner Hauptbeschäftigungen."

> zu können . . . . Der deutsche jedoch muß erst von Rual dazu aufgefordert werden, die Schwertleite zu erbitten, die ihm den Weg öffnet, des Vaters Tod zu rächen . . . . Die jungenhafte Art des kleinen Jägermeisters, . . . sein unkonventionelles Verhalten bei der Nachricht vom Tode seines Vaters und diese Unselbständigkeit, alle diese Züge sprechen für die Absicht des deutschen Dichters, einen jüngeren Helden zu zeichnen, als ihn die Quelle schildert. Mit dieser Änderung wird das innere Werden stärker betont.[43]

An important aspect of Heimerle's argument concerns Tristan's lack of independence. A close examination of the text reveals that Gottfried accentuates Tristan's dependency by first having him conclude that he has lost two "fathers" (i. e. Riwalin and Rual) and then by having him regain two "fathers" (i. e. Rual and King Marke [Tristan 4367-86]). The result is that Tristan is first made dependent by being "orphaned" as it were and then made doubly dependent by the introduction of two father figures, both of whom then alternate in advising him (Tristan 4387-95, 4446-89). In this way, the decision to proceed with an investiture ceremony for Tristan becomes essentially a collective one, rather than Tristan's alone.

It is important to note, however, that Tristan was probably already being groomed to become a knight before Rual arrived at King Marke's court. Gottfried alludes to this fact when, in an apparent addition to his source (cf. Tristram 31), he has one of the members of the court tell Rual upon his arrival that Tristan is supposed to become a knight

---

[43] Magda Heimerle, Gottfried und Thomas. Ein Vergleich (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Moritz Diesterweg, 1942) 64. It should be noted that Heimerle's view that Gottfried wished to depict a younger hero than did his predecessor, Thomas, appears to be in agreement with Gottfried's previous treatment of his protagonist. For instance, subsequent to Tristan's release by the merchants, Gottfried introduced a crying scene along with a brief commentary, suggesting that Tristan was still a child (cf. Tristan 2482-86). Thus, it may certainly be concluded that Gottfried described a younger Tristan than did Thomas or, at the very least, wished to make his audience more aware of Tristan's youth.

(Tristan 3914-15). Thus, that Tristan will eventually become a knight appears to be a foregone conclusion.

Another possible reason why Tristan does not himself ask to be dubbed a knight is put forth by Stein:

> Offenbar bewußt hat Gottfried den Übertritt des Geschehens in die höfische Ebene hervorgehoben, hat den in der Quelle dominierenden - unhöfischen - Rachegedanken zurückgedrängt zugunsten der F ä h i g k e i t T r i s t a n s , n u n s e l b s t Herrscherverantwortung zu übernehmen, und schließlich Tristan die Rolle dessen zugedacht, der sich nicht vordrängt, sondern dessen höfisch-ritterliche Qualitäten es den anderen unbedingt nötig erscheinen lassen, ihn zum Ritter zu machen.[44]

A comparison of this scene with the corresponding one in Gottfried's source tends to support Stein's observation that Gottfried has shifted the focus from the protagonist's need for revenge to his desire to begin to accept adult responsibility and to tend to his own affairs. Whereas Tristan is advised by Rual to ask to be dubbed a knight in order to subsequently take control of his own affairs (Tristan 4390-95), Tristram appears to be motivated primarily by his desire for revenge as illustrated by this excerpt from Thomas' work:

> Then Tristram approached his kinsman, the king and fell to his knees before him and said to him: "Sire, I want you to provide me with armor, for I wish to visit my nativeland and patrimony and to avenge the death of my father. [my emphasis] For I am now old enough to be able to seek to regain my rightful property." (Tristram 33)

It appears then that Gottfried did indeed wish to omit any reference to revenge as motivation for Tristan to want to become a knight and, thus, Tristan does not himself ask to be made a knight, but instead, is counselled by Rual and King Marke, whose wisdom prevails. Nevertheless, it should be

---

[44] Peter K. Stein, "Tristans Schwertleite. Zur Einschätzung ritterlich-höfischer Dichtung durch Gottfried von Straßburg," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 51 (1977): 307.

noted that by accepting Stein's argument, one need not necessarily reject Heimerle's contention that Gottfried wished to portray a more youthful protagonist. In fact, the two views can be seen to complement one another, for if Tristan is too young to be able to decide on his own whether he should be dubbed a knight, then he is also probably too young to entertain thoughts of avenging his father's death.

One last item worth noting concerns Gottfried's addition to his source of a discourse in which Tristan considers whether he should become a knight and bemoans the fact that he did not dedicate his youth to the pursuit of worldly honour by engaging in knightly activities (Tristan 4405-45). Some of the sentiments contained in this discourse, especially those concerning the incompatibility of idleness with knightly honour (cf. Tristan 4426-34), are reminiscent of similar comments found in both Hartmann's Erec (cf. Erec 2966-73) and Iwein (cf. Iwein 2783-94), concerning Erec's verligen. Since it is known that Gottfried was familiar with and an admirer of Hartmann's work (cf. Tristan 4621-37), it is quite possible that the views expressed in Tristan's discourse concerning knighthood reflect the influence of Hartmann upon Gottfried. In any event, it can be said that the comments contained in Tristan's discourse reflect positively on the institution of knighthood and reveal that Gottfried's and Hartmann's respective views concerning knighthood may not be as dissimilar as has sometimes been assumed.

3. The Investiture

Before Gottfried begins his description of Tristan's investiture ceremony, he first describes briefly the appearance of the thirty knights, whom Tristan has chosen to accompany him on his journey home to his father's land (Tristan 4577-88). Then, in a typical humility formula, the poet claims to lack the skills necessary to adequately describe Tristan's appearance, since others before him have

done a better job of describing such things (Tristan 4589-4620). Finally, he introduces a literary excursus, in which he passes judgement on his literary contemporaries (Tristan 4621-4820), followed by an extended plea to the muses for the literary ability to describe Tristan's armour (Tristan 4821-4974).

Literary criticism on Gottfried's treatment of Tristan's investiture has tended to view the poet's introduction of the literary excursus as a replacement for the investiture ceremony itself. Not surprisingly then, Gottfried's alleged omission of the investiture ceremony has been seen as being indicative of a negative attitude towards knighthood. As early as 1959, W. T. H. Jackson noted,

> Indicative of Gottfried's attitude to worldly chivalry is his refusal to describe the most important ritual in the life of a knight, the swertleite or induction into knighthood.[45]

Then in 1971, Batts stated,

> The most striking evidence of Gottfried's attitude toward knighthood, its pomp and circumstance and the disparity between theory and practice is contained in the description of the knighting of Tristan. Gottfried begins this passage in a stereotyped manner with a complaint of his inability to do justice to the description of such a ceremony, and instead of making the attempt, he does not describe the ceremony, but instead provides his audience with a short history of the literature of the past two generations.[46]

---

[45] R. S. Loomis, Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959) 150. Please note that Chapter 14 of this book, in which the aforementioned quotation appears, was written by W. T. H. Jackson. Cf. W. T. H. Jackson, "Tristan the Artist in Gottfried's Poem," Publications of the Modern Language Association 77 (1962): 365. Cf. Karl O. Brogsitter, Artusepik (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965) 106.

[46] Michael S. Batts, Gottfried von Straßburg (New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1971) 79. Cf. Ruth Goldschmidt Kunzer, The Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg. An Ironic Perspective (Berkeley: University of Californis Press, 1973)

And as late as 1981, Noble observed,

> Most significant, however, is the omission, stated by the author to be deliberate, of the description of Tristan's induction into knighthood, the so-called swertleite.[47]

It is clear, then, that critics have been fairly consistent in their assessment of Gottfried's treatment of the investiture scene.

A common feature of literary criticism concerning the investiture scene is the misconception that Gottfried has categorically refused to describe Tristan's investiture and, therefore, must have replaced it with his literary excursus. Such a view, however, appears to be based upon both a misreading of the text and a failure to compare Gottfried's text with that of his source.

A thorough examination of Gottfried's text clearly reveals that he never refuses to describe Tristan's investiture, but rather he claims to be unable to adequately prepare Tristan for his investiture, that is to say, to describe his appearance (cf. Tristan 4589-4620, 4824-58). Therefore, Gottfried's comments concerning his alleged inability to describe rîcheite and his reluctance to portray ritterlîchiu zierheit, due supposedly to the abundance of such descriptions given in other works, should be viewed in the context in which they are presented (cf. Tristan 4612-20). They apply specifically to Gottfried's unwillingness to provide a description of Tristan's appearance, rather than to an alleged refusal to depict the investiture ceremony.

Further evidence of Gottfried's actual intention comes later in the text, after the literary excursus. Gottfried

---

86.

[47] Cecil A. M. Noble, "Gottfried von Straßburg's Tristan and Isolt-Courtly and Uncourtly," Cecil A. M. Noble: Spielbewußtsein. Essays zur deutschen Literatur und Sprache (Bern: Verlag Peter Lang AG, 1981) 91.

continues to claim to be incapable of describing Tristan's appearance while paradoxically actually proceeding to do so (Tristan 4929-64). It is at this point that he reveals his rationale for not wanting to portray Tristan's appearance. He states that to do so would have the same effect as did his earlier description of Tristan's thirty companions, in which he described their apparel in terms of qualities (i.e. hôher muot, vollez guot, bescheidenheit, and höfischer sin [Tristan 4563-82]) deemed to be desirable for a knight to possess (Tristan 4929-64). Gottfried then concludes his rather lengthy discourse on Tristan's appearance by clothing him in the same manner as he did his companions (Tristan 4965-74).

The message that Gottfried seems to convey to his reader is that a knight should not be judged solely on the basis of his physical appearance. Rather, a knight, in Gottfried's view, should possess the following attributes: muot/courage; vollez guot/adequate financial resources; bescheidenheit/discretion; and höfischer sin/courtliness. Possession of these qualities, then, appears to form the basis of Gottfried's definition of knighthood.[48]

A comparison of Gottfried's treatment of the investiture scene with that of his source can provide further support for the view that Gottfried did not omit the investiture scene. In Thomas' Tristram, Tristram's investiture consists of the following: Two vassals fit Tristram with spurs, and King Markis presents him with a sword. King Markis then proceeds

---

[48] It should be recalled that Tristan's father, Riwalin, appeared to possess only the first two of these qualities (i.e. courage and adequate financial resources [cf. Tristan 245-59, 335-46]). He probably did not possess either discretion or courtliness as attested to repectively by both his penchant for recklessness and his stated need to improve himself by travelling to King Marke's kingdom (cf. Tristan 260-64, 455-59). Therefore, our earlier conclusion that Gottfried appeared to reject the type of knighthood practised by Riwalin seems to be supported by Gottfried's own definition of knighthood.

to dub Tristram a knight while advising him on how a knight should acquit himself (Tristram 33). On the other hand, in Gottfried's work, Tristan's investiture proceeds as follows: Tristan and his thirty companions attend mass, where they receive a blessing. The church visit is then followed by King Marke's presentation to Tristan of a sword and spurs after which he dubs Tristan a knight while counselling him on how a knight should conduct himself. Tristan receives a shield from King Marke, and then Tristan himself dubs his thirty companions knights in the same way as King Marke had dubbed him a knight. Lastly, a bohort, which is not described in any detail, is ridden in celebration of the investiture (Tristan 4975-5068).

It is apparent, then, that Gottfried did not remove the investiture scene from his work. On the contrary, not only did the poet retain the investiture scene found in his source, but he also expanded it by including a church visit by the participants, a dubbing of Tristan's companions, and a bohort (Tristan 5012-18, 5046-53, 5054-60).

In light of these observations, the question arises as to why literary critics appear to be unanimous in concluding that Gottfried did not include the investiture scene in his work. One possible explanation could be the poet's earlier introduction of the literary excursus and extended humility formula (Tristan 4547-4974). This addition results in the actual investiture scene being shifted forward and, therefore, appearing later in the text. Consequently, after having read Gottfried's rather lengthy and elaborate appraisal of his literary contemporaries (along with his pleas to the muses), it is understandable that a literary critic, particularly one who has already decided that Gottfried views knighthood negatively, would overlook the comparatively lacklustre investiture scene and conclude that the literary excursus is its replacement.

One aspect of the investiture scene that has attracted

considerably less attention concerns King Marke's advice to Tristan upon dubbing him a knight. A comparison of this part of the investiture scene with its counterpart in Gottfried's source suggests that the advice given to the protagonist appears to have been totally altered. In Thomas' work the advice given to Tristram is as follows:

> "My dear nephew, never take a blow from anyone unless you avenge it at once. Accept no other reparation or redress except a blow for a blow as long as you can revenge yourself. Thus will you do honor to your knighthood." (Tristram 33)

On the other hand, in Gottfried's work the advice Tristan receives reads, in part, as follows:

> wis diemüete und wis unbetrogen
> wis wârhaft und wis wolgezogen;
> den armen den wis iemer guot,
> den rîchen iemer hochgemuot;
> ziere und werde dînen lîp,
> êre unde minne elliu wîp;
> wis milte unde getriuwe
> und iemer dar an niuwe! (Tristan 5029-36)[49]

Upon comparing these two versions of the king's message to the protagonist, it is clear that the major difference between them is that the revenge motif, which was so predominant in Thomas' version, is nowhere to be found in Gottfried's rendering of the same scene. Stein voices a similar sentiment:

> Der offenbar die Rachepflicht symbolisierende Schwertschlag wird ersetzt durch eine viel weniger aussagekräftige Verleihungshandlung . . . In Markes Rede ist von Rache keine Rede mehr.[50]

In place of the revenge motif one finds a list of qualities, the possession of which is deemed to be desirable for a knight. Included among these qualities are the following: diemüete/modesty; triuwe/loyalty; and milte/generosity

---

[49] It should be noted that King Marke's rather lengthy discourse actually consists of twenty-three verses (cf. Tristan 5022-45).

[50] Stein 328.

(Tristan 5029, 5035, 5040).[51]

The substitution of the revenge motif with the aforementioned qualities obviously results in a more courtly message, and this fact has been noticed by at least one critic. Piquet remarks,

> Gottfried . . . met dans la bouche de Marc des paroles généreuses, des conseils d'abnegation et de dévouement qui cadrent mieux avec l'ideal chevaleresque de l'epoque de Gottfried et le caractère du poète. L'influence de Hartmann a aussi contribué a cette modification.[52]

Piquet's suggestion that Gottfried's decision to insert a list of courtly qualities in place of the revenge motif may have been due to the influence of Hartmann is certainly within the realm of probability. It is known that Gottfried was familiar with and an admirer of Hartmann's work (cf. Tristan 4621-37). Furthermore, a glance at Hartmann's Gregorius reveals a list of courtly virtues in the body of the text which are quite similar to those virtues contained in King Marke's message to Tristan.[53] The fact that Hartmann's Gregorius is believed to have been written

---

[51] The entire list of desirable knightly qualities is to be found in Tristan 5027-40, 5045.

[52] Felix Piquet, L'originalité de Gottfried de Strasbourg dans son poème de Tristan et Isolde (Lille, France: l'université de Lille, 1905) 126.

[53] Hartmann von Aue, Gregorius der gute Sünder, trans. Burkhard Kippenberg (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1983) 248-58. It is interesting to note that in Hartmann's Erec there is a description given of Gawan while he is at a team tournament at King Arthur's court which contains some of the very same courtly qualities mentioned previously (Erec 2720-44). For instance, Hartmann's Erec and Gregorius as well as Gottfried's Tristan all include passages which stress the importance of triuwe/loyalty and milte/generosity (cf. Gregorius 248-58/Tristan 5022-45).

sometime between 1190 and 1197,[54] whereas Gottfried's Tristan is thought to have been written in 1210,[55] provides additional support for the supposition that Gottfried may have been influenced by Hartmann when making changes to this scene.

Another possibility, however, which one may infer from Piquet's comments, is that Gottfried's alteration to King Marke's message is simply reflective of the time in which the poet lived. The list of courtly virtues, then, that Gottfried adds to his text are those values which the people at his time embraced. In support of this fact one need only look at the work of another one of Gottfried's contemporaries, Wolfram von Eschenbach. In Wolfram's Parzival, for example, the advice that Gurnemanz gives Parzival is similar to that found in both Gottfried's Tristan and Hartmann's Gregorius.[56] The fact that these three poets' respective lists of courtly virtues pertaining to knighthood share some similarities also suggests that Gottfried's view of knighthood is both positive and not as dissimilar from that of Hartmann and Wolfram as has widely been assumed.

The view that Gottfried's desire to make King Marke's message to Tristan more courtly is due to Gottfried's being a product of his time can also be applied to the entire investiture scene. In this respect, it is helpful to look at

---

[54] Peter Wapnewski, Hartmann von Aue, 7th ed. (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1979) 29.

[55] Gottfried Weber and Werner Hoffmann, Gottfried von Straßburg, 5th ed. (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1981) 53.

[56] Wolfram von Eschenbach, Parzival, study edition (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1965), Book III: lines 170 (verse 10)-173 (verse 6). Please note that all three works list diemüete/modesty and milte/ generosity as courtly virtues that a knight should possess ([Tristan 5029, 5040]; [Gregorius 248-249]; [Parzival: Book III, line 170, verses 21-28]).

two other minor but no less relevant changes that the poet made to this particular scene.

Firstly, Gottfried adds a church visit at the beginning of the investiture ceremony, during which Tristan and his thirty companions hear mass and receive a blessing (Tristan 5012-18, 5022-26). The addition of a religious observance to the investiture ceremony appears to approximate historical reality. In this connection, Bumke notes,

> Die Einführung von christlichen Gedanken hat die alte Wehrhaftmachung zur hochmittelalterlichen Schwertleite, zur 'Ritterweihe' gemacht.[57]

As further evidence of the historical link between religion and the investiture ceremony in the high Middle Ages one need only look at the Nibelungenlied. Believed to have been written around the year 1200,[58] it also contains an investiture ceremony which begins with a mass being heard for the participants (Nibelungenlied strophes 29-33).[59] It may be concluded, then, that, among those German poets whose works contained investiture ceremonies, there appears to have been general agreement about the importance of religion to the investiture ceremony.

Secondly, Gottfried, in another addition to his source, makes reference to a bohort, which takes place at the end of the investiture ceremony (Tristan 5054-60). Once again, a perusal of the Nibelungenlied reveals that its author also mentions a bohort held at the conclusion of the investiture

---

[57] Joachim Bumke, Studien zum Ritterbegriff im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag, 1964) 109.

[58] Helmut Brackert, ed. and trans., Das Nibelungenlied. 1. Teil. Mittelhochdeutscher Text und Übertragung (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH, 1986) 287.

[59] The connection between religion and knighthood in general appears to be a characteristic of the high Middle Ages and of its literature. In Hartmann's Erec, for instance, the knights at King Arthur's court first attend mass before competing in a tournament held there (Erec 2487-2502).

ceremony presented in that work (Nibelungenlied strophes 34-36). Thus, Gottfried's addition of the bohort, like his earlier addition of the church visit, can be viewed as an attempt to make the investiture scene more courtly and, consequently, more contemporary as well.

Nevertheless, the only attention that the poet's addition of the bohort has received among literary critics has been condemnation due to the fact that it is not described in any detail. One such critic is Krohn, who notes,

> Unzweifelhaft spricht etwa die geringschätzige Weigerung, über das prachtvolle Turnier im Anschluß an Tristans Schwertleite ausführliche Auskunft zu geben, für Gottfrieds ablehnende Distanz gegenüber solch fragwürdigem Waffengetöse . . . .[60]

While it is true that Gottfried's comments concerning the bohort do appear to reflect a certain unwillingness to provide a more detailed description of it (Tristan 5056-62), it is unfair to suggest, as Krohn apparently does, that Gottfried rejects the institution of the bohort outright or, for that matter, knighthood per se. In this regard, it is important to remember that Gottfried's allusion to the bohort is in fact a deviation from his source, which did not include any reference whatsoever to a bohort at the end of the investiture scene (cf. Tristram 33). Consequently, if Gottfried did indeed view the bohort with disdain, it seems rather unlikely that the poet would bother adding a bohort to his investiture scene solely to discredit it as an institution. Yet, the question remains as to why Gottfried did not embellish his description of the bohort.

---

[60] Gottfried von Straßburg, Tristan, vol. 3: Kommentar, Nachwort und Register, ed. and trans. Rüdiger Krohn (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1981) 217. Cf. Stein 328, who states: "Das zu erwartende Turnier wird von Gottfried dann nicht nur nicht geschildert, sondern diese Schilderung, Prunkstück eines höfischen Epos wird brutal als etwas, das die garzune sagen (5059) sollen, abgelehnt."

One possible reason for Gottfried's apparent lack of interest in the bohort could be his desire to make King Marke's message to Tristan the focal point of the investiture scene. One observation which tends to support this view is the fact that the poet dedicates twenty-three verses to the king's message as compared with only six verses for the church visit and nine verses for the bohort (Tristan 5022-45, 5012-18, 5053-62). Thus, it would appear that, for Gottfried, the king's message takes precedence over both the church visit and the bohort.

A consideration of the historical development of the bohort (or tournament) would appear to provide a possible explanation for the poet's treatment of the bohort. According to Pütz the transition from the twelfth to the thirteenth century brought with it the introduction of blunted weapons for the participants as well as the inclusion of an audience comprised primarily of noble ladies.[61] Such changes can be said to have transformed the bohort from a serious life-or-death contest to an event valued primarily for its entertainment value. Evidence of this transformation can be seen in the Nibelungenlied, in which the description of the bohort consists primarily of a brief recounting of how (and how many of) the knights' lances shattered upon impact (Nibelungenlied strophes 35-36).

Given the entertainment aspect inherent in the bohort at Gottfried's time, it is understandable that the poet, who wishes to highlight the king's message (i.e. the knightly precepts contained within it), would be somewhat reluctant to provide such a description of the bohort. Instead, he simply states that he will not bother to speak of shattered lances (Tristan 5056-60). In this way, the poet prevents his audience from becoming engrossed in the bohort to the point of forgetting the knightly advice given by King Marke, which

---

[61] See Footnotes #24 and #25.

is the heart of the investiture scene.

Overall, the changes that Gottfried has made to the original investiture scene provided by Thomas (i.e. alteration of king's message and addition of church visit and bohort) are indicative of a positive attitude towards the institution of knighthood. Notwithstanding the poet's apparent indifference towards the bohort, it is inconceivable that he would have taken the time to make the kinds of changes that he did, had he, in fact, been negatively predisposed towards knighthood and its adherents.[62]

D. Tristan's Battles as a Knight

Literary criticism has tended to view Gottfried's treatment of the battles in Tristan as further indication of an alleged rejection of knighthood. In 1939, Grundmann noted,

> Gottfried geht der Kampfschilderung am liebsten ganz aus dem Wege. Er konnte es umso leichter, als das Thema seines Romans ihm auch nicht allzu oft Gelegenheit dazu gab; hatte er aber wirklich einmal die Möglichkeit zur Schilderung, so lehnt er es mit überlegener Geste ab, davon zu sprechen . . . . Es ist die Haltung der [sic] Bürgers, die aus diesen Zeilen spricht, der nur wenig Verständnis für das Kämpferische in der ritterlichen Lebensanschauung aufbringen konnte.[63]

---

[62] It is worth noting that, shortly after mentioning the bohort, Gottfried--in a deviation from his source--concludes the investiture scene by imploring that God grant Tristan and his thirty companions a knightly life (cf. Tristan 5061-68). These are most certainly not the words of a poet who--according to many literary critics--views knighthood negatively.

[63] Karl Grundmann, Studien zur Speerkampfschilderung im Mittelhochdeutschen. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des höfischen Stil- und Lebensgefühls (Warsaw: Josef Piludski University, 1939) 221. It should be noted that Grundmann refers specifically to Gottfried's treatment of the bohort in the investiture scene. Our earlier discussion of that scene suggested that Gottfried's alleged refusal to describe the bohort at length was probably motivated by a desire to focus attention on the king's advice to Tristan rather than by a negative predisposition towards knighthood.

And, a year later in 1940, de Boor stated,

> Im eigentlichen Tristanteil fordern Stoff und Quelle eingehendere Kampfschilderungen; wir ersehen aus ihnen, daß Gottfried auch solcher Aufgabe gewachsen war. Aber auch hier sind Gottfrieds Bemühungen um die Abwertung des eigentlich Waffenhaften zu spüren. Es ist bekannt, wie er die beiden Kernszenen, Schwertleite und Moroltkampf fast krampfhaft entrittert hat . . . .[64]

Then, in 1977, Stein observed,

> Tristan ist kein Musterritter, letzlich beruhen seine Hilfeleistungen jeweils auf einem ganz handgreiflichen Eigeninteresse.[65]

Lastly, in 1987, Bekker commented,

> However, all we know for certain as far as Gottfried's fragment is concerned is that Tristan for a long time fails to act as a knightly knight. The inference must be that his knighthood and his 'adventures' are situated in a domain that is not of the court. That domain, we have suggested it before, is the domain of Eros.[66]

It is apparent, then, that there is general agreement among literary critics concerning Gottfried's depiction of knighthood in his battle scenes.

Although the various critics give little indication as

---

[64] Helmut de Boor, "Die Grundauffassung von Gottfrieds Tristan," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 18 (1940): 278. Our earlier analysis of the investiture scene suggests that de Boor's views concerning Gottfried's treatment of the investiture scene are in error.

[65] Peter K. Stein, "Tristans Schwertleite. Zur Einschätzung ritterlich-höfischer Dichtung durch Gottfried von Straßburg," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 51 (1977): 340. Stein also refers to the Morold battle as being "die ärgste Verfälschung ritterlichen Kämpfens."

[66] Hugo Bekker, Gottfried von Strassburg's Tristan: Journey through the Realm of Eros (Columbia, South Carolina: Camden House, 1987) 96. It should be noted that Bekker, who adopts a psychoanalytical approach, never does define what he means when he refers to the domain/realm of Eros. It seems to be a concept that he uses whenever he is unable to account for some action in Gottfried's work.

to why Gottfried would want to portray knighthood in a negative light, one important feature of the battle scenes in Gottfried's work may help to explain critics' general dissatisfaction with them.[67]

An examination of these battles reveals that they are fairly realistic, certainly more so than those found in contemporary works such as Hartmann's Erec or Iwein.[68] It is possible, then, that some critics have focused upon the realistic nature of these battles and mistakenly perceived it as further evidence of the generally-held view that Gottfried rejects knighthood.

There are, however, a number of alternative explanations which may help to account for the more realistic nature of the battles in Gottfried's work. One such explanation is offered by Stein:

> Es ist eine andere Dichtungsauffassung, die es Gottfried unmöglich macht, auf idealisierte Aventiure zurückzugreifen. Kampf ist bei Gottfried eben kriegshandwerk, aus einer bestimmten politisch nachvollziehbaren Situation sich ergebende, stark praxis- und nicht ethosbezogene Verteidigung oder - auch wieder realitätsnäher -

---

[67] One notable exception is Grundmann, who believes that Gottfried's alleged bourgeois status made it impossible for him to appreciate the importance of knightly battle. For a discussion of this topic and a refutation of the "Gottfried must be anti-knightly because he is a bourgeois" stance see CHAPTER I and the beginning of CHAPTER IV.

[68] It should be noted that the term realism as used here should not be equated with modern concepts of realism. When we refer to the battles in Tristan as being more realistic than those in other works, we mean that the former appear to more closely approximate actual battles than do the latter. This does not mean, however, that these battles conform exactly to actual battles. Evidence of this is the observation that these battles contain fantastic elements such as poisoned swords, giants, and dragons.

Angriff aus welchem Grunde immer.[69]

Stein's view that Gottfried's depiction of battles is due to the poet's literary conception does seem to have some merit. It has been very evident during the course of our analysis of Tristan, that Gottfried, in contrast to his predecessor, Thomas, has attempted to infuse greater realism into his work with the result that events in his work seem to follow more logically from what has occurred prior to them.

Another possible reason for the realistic nature of the battle scenes involving the protagonist could be the fact that Gottfried's work is not an Arthurian romance.[70] In this regard, Haug suggests that it is specifically the lack of Arthurian structure[71] which is responsible for this

---

[69] Stein 340. Cf. Gottfried von Straßburg, Tristan, vol. 3: Kommentar, Nachwort und Register, ed. and trans. Rüdiger Krohn (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1981) 222. Krohn notes: "[K]riegerische Konflikte innerhalb seines Romans dienen stets konkreten, offensichtlichen Zwecken[:] Fehden verfolgen handfeste wirtschaftliche oder politische Interessen; Heldentum richtet sich auf rationale, unmittelbare Ziele. Dadurch aber erhält die ideale Welt der beim zeitgenössischen Publikum so populären Artus-Dichtung, die Gottfried mit dem Prinzip nachvollziehbarer Funktionalität anreichert, einen bislang ungekannten realistischen Akzent." It should be noted that Krohn attributes Gottfried's pragmatic depiction of battles to an alleged bourgeois inability to relate to the knightly concept of performing knightly deeds for the sake of honour and glory alone. However, the fact that the bourgeoisie, for instance, organized its own tournaments seems to disprove Krohn's assertion (cf. Horst P. Pütz, "Auf der Suche nach der Aventiure," AUGIAS 23 [1986]: 18.).

[70] W. T. H. Jackson, The Anatomy of Love. The Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971) 150-151. Jackson states: "Gottfried's descriptions of battles do not follow the generalized, idealized pattern of Arthurian romance. They are full of very pertinent detail, detail which belies the idea that Gottfried, the bourgeois, knew nothing of knightly matters."

[71] The term Arthurian structure is meant to refer, in general, to the stereotypical pattern of battles in which the Arthurian hero engages and, in particular, to the connection

realism:

> Tristans Kämpfe dagegen müssen, da sie nicht in dieser Weise von einer vorgegebenen Symbolstruktur getragen werden, ihre Bedeutung aus sich selbst beziehen, d. h. die Kämpfe bedürfen eines spezifischen Charakters, aus dem Sinn und Funktion im Handlungszusammenhang abzulesen sind. Es fällt damit die Verbindlichkeit bestimmter Formen, die in Korrespondenz stehen mit höfischer Selbstdarstellung: der Kampfstil wird frei; die Vorgänge können häßlich und gemein werden.[72]

Haug's point seems well-taken. If the characteristic way in which the hero's series of battles in an Arthurian romance unfolds (i.e. revolution around a crisis concerning his knighthood), can be said to result in idealistic battles, then it stands to reason that the hero's battles in a non-Arthurian romance, which lacks this structure, would not possess the same degree of idealism. Consequently, one would expect the protagonist's battles in Gottfried's Tristan, which is a non-Arthurian romance, to be less idealistic (i.e. more realistic) than those in an Arthurian romance such as, for example, Hartmann's Erec or Iwein; and this indeed appears to be the case.

A corollary of this argument is that if, as we have suggested, critics' displeasure with Gottfried's depiction of knighthood has been due, at least in part, to the realistic nature of the battle scenes, then implicit in their dissatisfaction is the assumption that Tristan is an Arthurian romance. Such a presupposition, however, ignores the fact that Gottfried differs from a poet of the Arthurian tradition such as Hartmann in that he did not choose as his source Chrétien de Troyes, the originator of the Arthurian

---

between these battles and the specific flaw of the hero (which, of course, results in a conflict between his knighthood and love/marital obligations).

[72] Walter Haug, "âventiure in Gottfrieds von Straßburg Tristan," Festschrift für Hans Eggers, ed. Herbert Backes (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1972) 111-112.

romance, but rather Thomas of Brittany who himself wrote a non-Arthurian romance. Since a medieval poet was expected to adhere to his source as closely as possible (and since Gottfried appears to have been a strong proponent of this philosophy), it stands to reason that Gottfried's Tristan would necessarily be a non-Arthurian romance and that the battle scenes, particularly those involving the protagonist, would reflect the work's non-Arthurian nature.

If Gottfried had indeed adapted his work from one by Chrétien, for example, one would be justified in concluding that his deviation from the framework of a typical Arthurian romance represented a possible negative predisposition towards the institution of knighthood. However, since the poet's work is decidedly non-Arthurian in nature, such a conclusion would be both misleading and simplistic.

In light of the pervasive negative appraisal of Gottfried's presentation of knighthood as reflected in Tristan's battle scenes a thorough analysis of these battles is in order. These battles, as well as any related text passages, will be (re-)examined in order to attempt to determine the poet's conception of knighthood. Although comparisons between Gottfried's Tristan and Hartmann's Erec and Iwein will be made when relevant, emphasis will be placed upon comparisons between Gottfried's Tristan and its source work. The purpose of this emphasis is to ascertain whether the poet's portrayal of knighthood is any more negative or positive than that of his source, Thomas of Brittany.

D. Battle with Morgan

At the close of the investiture ceremony and related festivities, Tristan asks King Marke for and is granted leave to return home to Parmenîe in order to get his affairs in order (Tristan 5110-70). Shortly thereafter, he sets sail from Cornwall along with his foster father, Rual, and an entourage of knights (Tristan 5171-76).

Upon their arrival, Rual disembarks first and proceeds

to extend an official welcome to Tristan, and then to each individual knight. Having dispensed with the formal greetings, Rual informs Tristan of his intention to transfer title of both his own holdings and those entrusted to him after the death of his father, Riwalin (Tristan 5208-16).

Subsequently, various lords and other important nobles are summoned to the presumed capital cit of Parmenîe, Canoêle, to hear, as the poet puts it, the truth about Tristan (Tristan 5267-83). They are all overjoyed at having Tristan back and proceed to welcome him, receive their fiefs from him, and pledge allegiance to him as loyal vassals (Tristan 5272-87).

Tristan, however, does not spend much time basking in the adulation of his followers. Secretly troubled by the loss of his father at the hands of Morgan, Tristan informs his friends and fellow noblemen that he wishes to travel to Brittany to receive his fief from his enemy, Morgan, so that his right to it will be unquestioned (Tristan 5288-5301). Tristan soon leaves for Brittany with his entourage of knights.

When Tristan arrives at his destination, he learns that Morgan is taking part in a hunt. He orders his knights to don their armour beneath their outer attire and divides the knights into two groups: one group of sixty knights to remain behind with the supply wagon; and a second group of thirty knights to accompany him (Tristan 5309-36).

Once Tristan and his knights locate Morgan, they are greeted cordially by both him and his Breton knights. Tristan asks Morgan for his fief, whereupon Morgan inquires as to his identity. Upon learning Tristan's identity, Morgan promptly dismisses Tristan's claim to a fief, since, according to Morgan, it is common knowledge that Riwalin's and Blanscheflur's relationship ended as a love affair rather than as a marriage (Tristan 5386-5402).

In response, Tristan becomes increasingly agitated as he

points out that Morgan not only killed his father, but now adds insult to injury by casting the legitimacy of his birth (and, therefore, his claim to a fief) in doubt. He goes on to note that many prominent men have sworn allegiance to him, and would not have done so had there been any doubt concerning his claim as Riwalin's heir (Tristan 5414-44). Morgan remains unconvinced and has the last word by remarking that Tristan's sword will never strike any member of the court, thereby possibly implying that Tristan is not of noble birth (Tristan 5446-48).

The "battle" between Morgan and Tristan, if one can call it that, both commences and ends as Tristan, incensed by Morgan's inflammatory comments, draws his sword, first striking Morgan with a blow to the head that pierces his opponent's skull and brain, and then stabbing him in the heart. Gottfried concludes the "battle" by commenting that Tristan's actions prove the veracity of the claim that though debts lie, they do not rot (Tristan 5451-58).

In the aftermath of Tristan's slaying of Morgan, the Breton knights attack Tristan and his companions. This battle rages on until Tristan and those of his knights who are still alive are encircled by the Breton knights (Tristan 5459-5546). It is only with the help of Rual, who (along with one hundred knights) has come to search for his foster son, that Tristan and his remaining companions are able to escape and eventually defeat their adversaries (Tristan 5547-5608).

The majority of literary critics have tended to view Tristan's battle with Morgan as unchivalrous. In 1971, Batts noted,

> His attack on Morgan is unchivalrous and not properly prepared and leads to a very dangerous situation for Tristan who, after killing his enemy, loses the initial advantage and is

surrounded by Morgan's followers.[73]

Later, in 1977, Stein observed,

> Tristans erste 'ritterliche' Tat ist ebensoweit von Idealität entfernt wie die seines Vaters. Er tötet Morgan auf unritterliche und hinterlistige, aber höchst praktische Weise.[74]

Finally, in 1986, Huber stated,

> [N]achdem der Vater im offenen Kampf gefallen ist, besteht für einen Blutracheakt kein Anlaß; die Auseinandersetzung mit Morgan ohne rechtlichen Rahmen, ohne Kampfansage, ist Überfall und Mord.[75]

It is fairly evident, then, that there is general consensus among literary critics concerning the protagonist's actions in the Morgan battle. In this connection, it must be conceded that Tristan's slaying of Morgan does indeed appear to be an unchivalrous act of aggression. Morgan is clearly not prepared to do battle with Tristan--since he is out on a hunt--and is, therefore, defenseless when Tristan draws his sword and begins attacking him.

In an apparent contradiction, the poet whose post-battle commentary would seem to endorse Tristan's actions (cf. Tristan 5456-58) also gives the reader some indication that the protagonist's behaviour in battle is somewhat less than

---

[73] Michael S. Batts, Gottfried von Straßburg (New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1971) 51. Cf. Haug 109, who states: "Die erste Rittertat Tristans ist ein Mord." Cf. Ruth Goldschmidt Kunzer, The Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg. An Ironic Perspective (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973) 54. She states: "This brutal, totally unchivalrous murder of an unarmed man by a knight who only recently had been admonished at his investiture ceremony to behave always in a courtly manner . . . is reminiscent of Riwalin's aggressive military ventures."

[74] Stein 339.

[75] Christoph Huber, Gottfried von Straßburg. "Tristan und Isolde". Eine Einführung (Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1986) 58.

chivalrous. Firstly, Gottfried deviates from his source by changing the locale for the battle from Morgan's court to a forest (cf. Tristan 5352-57, Tristram 34). Since in the Middle Ages the forest typically represented the uncourtly world, it follows that such a setting serves as an indicator that the battle itself will not be a model of chivalry. Lastly, in an addition to his source, Gottfried alerts his audience to the fact that Rual never advised Tristan to kill Morgan (Tristan 5555-56). In this way, the poet once again makes the audience aware of the unchivalrousness of Tristan's actions by distancing them from Rual and, consequently, the court as well.

It is not entirely clear why Gottfried would endorse the killing of Morgan while at the same time attempting to distance Tristan's actions from the court. One possible explanation, however, could be the fact that the narrative requires the death of Morgan. In order for the narrative to proceed, Tristan must get his affairs in order so that he may at a later point return to his uncle's kingdom. This ordering of his affairs with respect to both his property and emotional state (cf. Tristan 5623-33) is very important, since the poet believes that a man consists of his personality and his property, from which emanate both noble sensibility and worldly honour (Tristan 5692-5712). However, the poet also appears to realize that Tristan's actions are not those of a courtly knight and, therefore, cannot be seen to be linked directly to either Rual or to the court.

Although Tristan's battle with Morgan cannot be viewed as chivalrous, there are, nevertheless, a number of factors which serve to mitigate the protagonist's actions, and, perhaps more importantly, reveal that the poet need not necessarily be seen as a detractor of knighthood.

Firstly, Gottfried, in an apparent addition to his source, informs his reader, prior to the actual battle, of the emotional pain experienced by Tristan as a result of the

loss of his father. He goes on to note that the hero's youthfulness plays a significant part in determining the extent of the anger he feels towards Morgan (Tristan 5099-5102). It follows, then, that Tristan's youthfulness must, in large measure, be responsible for the severity of his response to Morgan's comments when the two men finally meet.

Secondly, during the course of their conversation, Morgan provokes Tristan by first insulting him and then, finally, by telling him that his sword will never strike a member of the court (Tristan 5445-49).

Thirdly, although the protagonist bears hidden ill will towards Morgan, the poet gives no real indication--despite claims by some critics to the contrary--that Tristan either intends or makes plans to avenge himself on his adversary.[76] In this connection, it should be noted that the poet has been fairly consistent in attempting to remove or, at the very least, tone down the revenge motif present in Thomas' work. It will be recalled from our discussion of the investiture scene that Thomas' Tristram actively pursues becoming a knight primarily in order to avenge his father's death, whereas Gottfried's Tristan has to be convinced to become a knight, since Rual and King Marke believe that he is old enough to assume adult responsibility (Tristan 4386-4401; cf. Tristram 33). Furthermore, King Markis' words to Tristram during the investiture ceremony counsel him to "never take a

---

[76] Rosemary Norah Combridge, Das Recht im 'Tristan' Gottfrieds von Straßburg (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1964) 27-28. Combridge asserts that revenge is Tristan's unspoken motivation throughout the Morgan episode. Cf. Goldschmidt Kunzer 58, who states that Tristan concentrates on "personal gain and revenge." Cf. Otto Langer, "Der Künstlerroman Gottfrieds-Protest bürgerlicher Empfindsamkeit gegen höfisches Tugendsystem?" Euphorion 68 (1974): 13, 14. Langer appears to stand alone in viewing Tristan not as the avenger of his father, but rather, as the rightful heir to his father's property, which Morgan wrongfully retains and withholds from him. Langer also mentions that Tristan never speaks of revenge. Langer's positon is one which we support.

blow from anyone else unless you avenge it at once", thereby encouraging retaliation for any perceived wrong (Tristram 33). This same advice is noticeably absent from King Marke's address to Tristan. The German protagonist is, instead, advised to pay heed to such things as his birth, loyalty, and nobility (Tristan 5019-45). Therefore Tristram's primary intent in searching for Morgan is to seek revenge, whereas Tristan's main motivation is to gain recognition of his fief. Both men in effect avenge their respective fathers' deaths, but it appears that only in Tristram's case was this the principal reason for seeking out Morgan. A last point to be made with respect to the revenge motif is that the actual instigating factor which makes Tristan kill Morgan is the fact that Morgan casts his parentage and noble status in doubt and thereby denies him his claim to a fief (Tristan 5397-5448).[77] Tristram faces a similar predicament, but the instigation in his case seems to be the fact that Morgan strikes him in the face, a situation which, according to the tenets of knighthood espoused by King Markis, requires nothing less than a retaliatory blow (Tristram 35).

Finally, Tristan appears to have as valid an argument as does Morgan concerning the legitimacy of his birth and, consequently, his claim to Riwalin's fief. Morgan voices the belief that the union of Blanscheflur and Riwalin ended as a love affair rather than a marriage (Tristan 5397-5405). In this way, he insinuates that Tristan is illegitimate and therefore unable to inherit his father's property. The text seems to provide partial support for Morgan's viewpoint. It will be recalled that Rual had advised Riwalin to publicly marry Blanscheflur after the resolution of hostilities with

---

[77] Félix Piquet, L'originalité de Gottfried de Strasbourg dans son poème de Tristan et Isolde (Lille, France; l'université de Lille, 1905) 134. Piquet comments: "Enfin ce n'est pas une brutale voie de fait, mais une offense morale qui détermine l'aggression de Tristan."

Morgan (Tristan 1623-29). Since Riwalin is soon killed in battle, however, the public marriage never takes place. At the same time, however, Riwalin was also advised to avow his marriage to Blanscheflur in a church ceremony which indeed takes place shortly before his untimely death (Tristan 1630-42).[78] Thus, Tristan is not entirely incorrect in claiming that his parents had been married shortly before his father's death and that he can provide proof thereof (Tristan 5438-44).[79]

Another point in Tristan's favour is the fact that his fellow nobles have all sworn allegiance to and received fiefs from him. As Tristan asserts, this would surely not have been the case had there been any doubt concerning his standing in courtly society (Tristan 5431-41). Hence, Tristan has every reason to believe that he is Riwalin's rightful heir, since no one has until now indicated to him otherwise. In addition, even if it should prove to be the case that his parents' church ceremony does not fulfil all the requirements of marriage as they existed in the Middle Ages, Tristan's recognition by his peers makes him nonetheless de facto heir to Riwalin's property.

It must be conceded, however, that Gottfried leaves the

---

[78] Gottfried von Straßburg, Tristan. With the 'Tristram' of Thomas, trans. A. T. Hatto (Markham: Penguin Books Canada Limited, 1985) 62. Hatto comments: "In the eyes of the law, Rivalin and Blancheflor [sic] had consummated a clandestine, runaway love match which needed only to be declared in church to obtain full validity."

[79] Cf. Combridge 42. She concludes: "Wir schließen also aus dem Vorangehenden, daß Tristan nach weltlichem Recht eine nur anfechtbare Ehelichkeit genoß, die Morgan mit gutem Recht tatsächlich anficht, daß er aber recht hat, wenn er behauptet, das Verhältnis zwischen seinen Eltern habe nicht als vriuntschaft geendet."

issue of Tristan's illegitimacy somewhat ambiguous.[80] One such indication is the fact that where the source work had only one marriage ceremony for Riwalin and Blanscheflur (Tristram 17), the German work has two (a church and a public ceremony) with only the first carried out (Tristan 1623-42). A likely reason for the introduction of ambiguity into the issue of Tristan's alleged illegitimacy could be the fact that it is this issue which ultimately leads to Morgan's death. As mentioned earlier, Gottfried has attempted to purge his work of the revenge motif found in the source work. He does this by having Tristan seek out Morgan primarily in order to gain recognition of his fief. It follows, then, that the issue of illegitimacy would necessarily play a larger role in Gottfried's work than in Thomas'; and this is indeed the case. In addition, making the illegitimacy issue ambiguous provides each knight with the moral justification for continuing the altercation. What the audience is left with is a conflict where the boundaries between right and wrong are somewhat blurred. There remain only two opponents with opposing viewpoints regarding the issue of Tristan's illegitimacy and his right to his father's fief.

A last point to be made concerning Tristan's battle with Morgan is that his actions are reminiscent of those of his

---

[80] Cf. Combridge 32, 40. The law concerning illegitimacy in the Middle Ages is also somewhat ambiguous. Combridge's research into this field reveals that Tristan could be considered either legitimate or illegitimate depending upon whether Gottfried's conception of illegitimacy reflects English or German law. According to English law, a child was considered to be illegitimate if born before the marriage. German law, on the other hand, held that a child conceived before marriage was deemed illegitimate. Combridge then goes on to note, however, that German law gradually began to conform to English law, but that a child could still be denied its inheritance by society. Since it is unclear which legal definition of illegitimacy prevailed in Gottfried's time or which one he wanted his work to reflect, the issue of Tristan's alleged illegitimacy must necessarily remain ambiguous.

father, Riwalin.[81] Gottfried criticizes Riwalin for not being able to overlook a hurt and states that this will lead to more hurt. In addition, this inability of Riwalin's is attributed to his youth (Tristan 275-94). In Tristan's case, he is unable to overlook the hurt caused him by Morgan; a hurt which is exacerbated by Morgan's inflammatory comments. As well, the poet tells his audience that Tristan's anger is as strong as it is, since he is young (Tristan 5088-5109, 5414-30).

Although Tristan's actions at this point in the text are similar to those of Riwalin, it should prove to be the case that, as he grows older, his actions in battle will be guided less by his feelings and more by what is right. In this respect, Heimerle notes that Gottfried's depiction of a younger Tristan than that found in the source reflects his desire to indicate a steady development of his hero.[82] Thus, one has good reason to believe that Tristan's future battles will reflect his maturation both as a person and as a knight.

2. Battle with Morold

At the conclusion of the altercation with Morgan and his Breton knights, Tristan organizes a large festival at which, in a deviation from his source work, he personally knights Rual's two sons along with twelve others including his former

---

[81] Cf. Goldschmidt Kunzer 54. Cf. Combridge 28, who states: ". . . diese Rache ist aber keine rechtlich zulässige, obgleich Tristan sie ausführt, als wenn sie eine solche wäre, sondern sie ist das Ergebnis eines empörten, ungebändigten Gefühls, das an den Charakter seines Vaters erinnert." Obviously we do not concur with Combridge's view that Tristan commits revenge or that his actions have no legal justification. However, we do agree with her assertion that Tristan's actions are, at least in part, due to his feelings. Furthermore, we agree that these feelings do indeed bear some similarity to those of his father.

[82] Magda Heimerle, Gottfried und Thomas. Ein Vergleich (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Moritz Diesterweg, 1942) 71.

tutor, Kurvenal (Tristan 5713-52). During the course of the festival he announces his intention to return to his uncle, King Marke, in Cornwall, since he is his sole heir. After entrusting his affairs to his foster father, Rual, Tristan (accompanied by Kurvenal) departs for Cornwall (Tristan 5782-5851).

Upon his arrival in Cornwall, a situation arises which immediately captures Tristan's attention. It seems that King Marke's kingdom is required to pay a yearly tribute to King Gurmûn of Ireland, who apparently had defeated Cornwall when King Marke was still a boy (Tristan 5867-5930). This year, however, the tribute consists of thirty handsome boys, who are to be taken to Ireland to presumably toil as servants at King Gurmûn's court (Tristan 5942-72).[83] Morold, the king's champion (and brother-in-law) arrives to claim the thirty boys and return with them to Ireland (Tristan 5931-69).[84]

---

[83] In an interesting deviation from his source, Gottfried changes the number of boys demanded as tribute from sixty to thirty. The reason for the change in number could be due to Gottfried's desire to draw an analogy to an infamous event in the Bible. It will be recalled that Judas Iscariot betrays Jesus to the chief priests (who answer, at least in part, to the Roman governor of Judea, Pontius Pilate) in exchange for thirty pieces of silver (Matthew 26:14-16). Correspondingly, the lords of England betray God in much the same way by, firstly, not trusting him to help one of them defeat Morold in single combat. And, secondly, by attempting to save their own lives through the "sacrifice" of the thirty boys to King Gurmûn, who is acting under the auspices of Rome (Tristan 5904-11, 5979-6006, 6103-28). Essentially, the lords "sell out" God to Gurmûn in much the same fashion as Judas "sold out" Christ to Pontius Pilate, who also represents Rome, by exchanging thirty pieces of silver. Cf. Iwein 6354-68. In the Battle With The Giants/Devil's Henchmen section it will be recalled that a young lord who failed to do battle against two giants is required to pay a tribute of thirty young women every year until such time as another knight is able to defeat both giants in battle.

[84] Cf. Hugo Bekker, Gottfried von Straßburg's Tristan: Journey through the Realm of Eros (Columbia, South Carolina: Camden House, 1987) 116. Bekker, who adopts a

According to the terms of the truce agreed to by both England and Ireland, the tribute must be paid until such time as England decides to launch a war against Ireland or someone successfully defeats Morold in single combat (Tristan 5964-78). However, since England has been weakened from its previous encounter with Ireland, the launching of a full-scale war is not feasible. The other alternative of single combat is not pursued, since none of the lords is prepared to risk his life fighting Morold. Thus, Tristan finds the lords drawing lots to determine whose sons will be required to accompany Morold to Ireland (Tristan 6007-47).

In a rather lengthy discourse Tristan proceeds to berate the lords for their cowardly behaviour and bemoans the fact that their faith in God was not strong enough to convince one of them to do battle with Morold (Tristan 6063-6134). In the absence of any opposition to Morold, Tristan offers himself (Tristan 6138-72). While acknowledging Morold's superiority in terms of strength and courage, Tristan remains confident that he will emerge victorious. In this regard, he cites God (got), right/justice (reht), and, to a lesser extent, his willing heart (williger muot) as the factors that should enable him--despite his inexperience--to triumph against Morold (Tristan 6173-92).

---

psychoanalytical approach, believes: "It is not too pretentious to suggest that the tribute has homosexual implications." He bases his view upon the observation that Morold displays some measure of kindness towards Tristan at a later point in the text and that only handsome boys are exacted as tribute. Bekker's characterization of Morold as an alleged homosexual pedophile, provocative though it may be, seems to be more a product of Bekker's rather vivid imagination than a result of a detailed analysis of the text. In this connection, it should be stated that, though it is unclear why only boys are chosen, the choice of tribute appears to be Gurmûn's. Morold, after all, acts only as Gurmûn's emissary. Lastly, Gottfried clearly informs his reader that the importance of the boys' appearance lies in the fact that they are to serve at court (Tristan 5956-63).

Another discourse follows in which Tristan addresses Morold directly. Tristan recounts the history of what has thus far transpired with respect to the issue of tribute (Tristan 6251-6333). The common thread that runs throughout his speech is the injustice of the current situation and the need for restoration of justice. He concludes by noting that in the name of God he will personally put an end to the injustice by planting his flag in Ireland (Tristan 6326-32).

Upon learning that Tristan's intentions are supported by King Marke and the lords, Morold accuses them of breaking their word with respect to the truce between the two countries (Tristan 6333-57).[85] Tristan promptly responds, however, by citing that the agreement allows England to avoid paying the tribute by agreeing to either war or to single combat (Tristan 6358-76). Morold is then given the option of single combat versus Tristan or war. He chooses the former, since he does not have enough men with him to effectively wage war against England (Tristan 6377-6406).

The actual battle is scheduled to take place in three days time (Tristan 6493-95).[86] However, before the battle

---

[85] At a later point in the text, Morold repeats this accusation (Tristan 6443-49). As in the Morgan battle there are two adversaries with opposing viewpoints. Only in the case of Morold and Tristan, however, does there seem to be a clear case of who is right and who is wrong. The provisions of the agreement between England and Ireland clearly allow England to fight, either in single combat or in war as an alternative to paying the tribute (Tristan 5956-69, 6358-76). Morold's position that Tristan's actions constitute a breach of the agreement is therefore untenable. Morold is clearly in the wrong.

[86] The three day wait for the battle to commence represents a deviation from the source work. In Thomas' work the battle begins almost immediately with minimal preparation (Tristram 41ff.). The significance of the three day delay could be Gottfried's desire to invoke an image of the Trinity. In this way, the poet signals his audience that God will ultimately determine the outcome of this battle. Since Tristan appears to be "God's champion," he, then, is destined

even begins Gottfried alludes to how it will end. He does this with his comments concerning the two knights and their armour. The poet notes that Morold was praised by many for his courage, strength, and size, but refuses to describe his armour (Tristan 6501-20). On the other hand, Gottfried concedes that Tristan is inexperienced in such dangerous undertakings, but then provides a rather lengthy, detailed description of the protagonist's armour (Tristan 6534-6720). In addition, he also notes that Tristan's superlative outer appearance was surpassed only by his inner qualities (Tristan 6570-77, 6635-51, 6715-20). In this way, the poet conveys to his audience the message that, though Tristan appears to be outmatched by Morold in this confrontation, the hero's inner qualities will shine through, allowing him to overcome adversity and defeat Morold.

The two adversaries are given two boats to carry them and their respective horses to a tiny island where the battle is to take place. When Morold reaches the island, he ties his boat up and begins to ride his horse energetically around the entire island (Tristan 6741-52). Tristan, on the other hand, arrives and promptly lets his boat drift away (Tristan 6791-93). Morold appears baffled and inquires as to the reason for Tristan's action. Tristan responds by stating that the battle will surely result in the death of at least one of the participants, thus only one boat need remain (Tristan 6799-6806). Morold then offers Tristan one final opportunity to forgo the battle and give him the tribute. Tristan, however, remains resolute in his conviction that the tribute must come to an end (Tristan 6820-32).

The battle itself begins with the two knights charging at one another on horseback. The result is that the lances and shields of both men break apart into a thousand pieces (Tristan 6833-61). The battle resumes with Tristan and Morold

---

to win the battle.

fighting with swords on horseback.

The poet briefly interjects to relate to the audience that Morold has the strength of four men. The odds are not stacked in Morold's favour, however, since so too does Tristan. It is at this point in the text that Gottfried reintroduces his allegory for Tristan. Tristan does not fight alone. Joining him in battle are God (got), right/justice (reht), and a willing heart (williger muot). Thus, Gottfried likens this battle to a war in which there are two opposing armies of four men each (Tristan 6866-6900).

The two knights charge at each other once again. This time, however, Tristan holds his shield too far from his body and receives a serious wound to the thigh (Tristan 6901-30). Morold asks Tristan to surrender, since, as he asserts, Tristan is fighting for the wrong cause (Tristan 6931-34). It turns out as well that Morold is using a poisoned sword and therefore Tristan's wound will certainly prove fatal. Morold offers to take Tristan to his sister, who can heal such a wound, if Tristan agrees to hand over the tribute (Tristan 6935-61). Tristan, however, rejects Morold's offer, since he will not break his promise to King Marke and the lords nor will he sully his reputation (Tristan 6962-69).[87]

The poet interjects once again to inform the reader that Tristan had until now only his willing heart (williger muot) to assist him against Morold. Now, however, God (got) and right/justice (reht) are coming to his aid (Tristan 6977-7002). Renewed strength and vigour are the result of this

---

[87] It is interesting to note that Tristan's comments represent a departure from the source work. As stated, Tristan continues the battle in order not to break his promise or damage his reputation. His counterpart, Tristram, however, continues the battle because he is confident that he will be able to avenge himself upon Morold for the blow that he has just received (Tristram 43ff.). This change in attitude represents yet another instance where Gottfried has sought to purge his work of the revenge motif, which figured so predominantly in Thomas' work.

aid, and Tristan begins doing battle anew.

Tristan strikes Morold's helmet, thereby knocking it off. Retaliation comes in the form of Morold lashing out at Tristan, which results in a serious injury to Tristan's horse. Morold races to retrieve his helmet and remount his own steed. By this time, however, Tristan manages to catch up with him and strikes his saddle. As a result, Morold loses his right hand along with his sword (Tristan 7020-49).

The altercation comes to a close as Tristan's sword makes contact with Morold's head to such an extent that a piece of the sword becomes embedded in Morold's skull. After a few sarcastic comments regarding the healing powers of Morold's sister, Tristan declares an end to the injustice of the tribute by decapitating Morold (Tristan 7050-85).

Literary criticism on the Morold battle has tended, for the most part, not to be critical of Tristan's knighthood. Tristan is generally viewed as a champion for justice, who fights on behalf of his fellow countrymen. In 1968, Spahr noted,

> Tristan the knight, waging battle against the giant Morolt, is, on the moral level, the failure of the chivalric eagerness to fight (Tristan is desperately wounded when accompanied only by this single ally and would doubtless have lost the fight if his other allies had not joined him); on the allegorical level it is the fight of Justice against Injustice - such a cause when supported anagogically by God will inevitably triumph.[88]

Later, in 1974, Langer observed,

> Als Triebfeder des Handelns des Protagonisten wird

---

[88] Blake Lee Spahr, "Tristan versus Morolt: Allegory Against Reality?" Festschrift für Helen Adolf, eds. S. Z. Buehne et al. (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing, 1968) 80. It should be noted that Tristan's situation is similar to that of Iwein. It will be recalled that the lion, who represents Christ, came to Iwein's rescue whenever his master, fighting for a just cause, faced insurmountable odds such that his life was in danger (Iwein 5050-62, 5375-88, 6737-94).

> nirgends Haß genannt - Morolt dagegen haßt Tristan (6225), - nur von seiner swaere angesichts des Unrechts ist die Rede.[89]

Finally, in 1986, Küsters stated,

> Nachdem er in seinen Reden und Ratsprüchen das Land als Rechts- und Friedensgemeinschaft nach innen und nach außen gleichsam theoretisch definiert hat, geht er daran, den theoretischen Anspruch im Kampf zu verwirklichen. Jetzt erst setzt er Gewalt gegen Gewalt (6458ff.) und benutzt den archaischen Ritus des Gerichtskampfes, um die Ordnung von lant unde reht (6427) wiederherzustellen.[90]

The only negative appraisal of the Morold battle and, in particular, of Tristan's actions in it has come from Goldschmidt Kunzer who concludes,

> The Morold episode, in which Tristan for the first time faces a knight in armed combat, is an occasion for the narrator's substantial irony directed against the rituals of chivalry in general and against his knight hero in particular.[91]

A possible reason for such criticism of the Morold battle could be the fact that it appears to be a fairly

---

[89] Langer 15.

Cf. Langer 17, who concludes: "Die Entschlossenheit Tristans gibt Zeugnis von seinem Verhältnis zum Recht. Er ergeht sich nicht wie die Barone in Tatenlosigkeit, Gebet und Lamentieren, sondern tritt unter Einsatz des eigenen Lebens für das Recht ein." Cf. Winfried Frey, Walter Raitz, and Dieter Seitz, Einführung in die deutsche Literatur des 12. bis 16. Jahrhunderts, vol. 1 (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1979) 233. Seitz remarks: "Er [d. h. Tristan] wird nicht irgendeinen Kampf gewissermaßen aus aventiure, sondern einen Kampf ums Recht führen - und ihn nicht zuletzt deshalb gewinnen."

[90] Urban Küsters, "Liebe zum Hof. Vorstellungen und Erscheinungsformen einer "höfischen" Lebensordnung in Gottfrieds Tristan," Höfische Literatur, Hofgesellschaft, Höfische Lebensformen um 1200. Kolloquium am Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung der Universität Bielefeld, 3.-5. Nov. 1983, eds. Gert Kaiser and Jan-Dirk Müller (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1986) 150-151.

[91] Goldschmidt Kunzer 67.

realistic depiction of a medieval battle. In this connection, W. T. H. Jackson comments,

> It would be hard to imagine a contest which departed more widely from the courtly tradition. Fought far from admiring crowds, with no ladies fluttering their kerchiefs, with a poisoned weapon and a deadly wound and a finish in which there is a scramble for position, a desperate blow, and an abrupt conclusion, it is probably far closer to a real thirteenth century fight than anything in Chrétien's work.[92]

As stated earlier (cf. Tristan's Battles as a Knight), the non-Arthurian nature of Gottfried's work almost demands a greater amount of realism than is typically found in an Arthurian work. A case in point is the Morold battle, which is essentially a trial by combat. If one compares this battle with another trial by combat, that of Iwein (Knight With The Lion) and Gawan, this difference becomes readily apparent (cf. Iwein 6939-7630).

The Iwein/Gawan battle takes place at the Arthurian court itself and is, therefore, an extremely idealistic depiction of a trial by combat. Hartmann tells his audience that neither knight even considered striking the other below the knees (i.e. below the other's shield--Iwein 7139-42). Consequently, the result is a battle in which there is no clear victor and which, therefore, ends in a stalemate.

Another trial by combat also takes place in Iwein, namely that of Iwein fighting the steward and his brothers on Lunete's behalf (Iwein 5178-5437). This battle, however, more closely approximates the Morold battle than does the Iwein/Gawan altercation. The participants actually do bodily

---

[92] W. T. H. Jackson, The Anatomy of Love. The Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971) 151-152. Jackson also cites Morold's death, Tristan's infected wound, and Morold's mutilation of Tristan's horse as further realistic elements. He continues: "The battle is, in fact, closer to a realistic fight than to a literary contest."

harm to one another and the vanquished either die in battle or are put to death at its conclusion. This battle's similarity to the Morold battle is probably due to the fact that it occurs outside the actual physical boundaries of the Arthurian court. In addition, Iwein does not represent the Arthurian court in this battle.

A typical trial by combat consists of two knights doing battle to settle a legal dispute; either their own or that of the parties they each represent. At the heart of the trial by combat (and, indeed, of any knightly battle) is the belief that God will permit the knight with the just cause to be victorious. The vanquished knight usually dies. His death is taken to be proof that his was the unjust cause, since surely God would not have allowed him to die had his cause been just. Gottfried's knowledge of the underlying rationale behind the trial by combat is therefore made clear when he has Tristan note that one of the participants will certainly die. (Tristan 6798-6806).

As for chivalry, it should be obvious that a typical trial by combat will almost certainly contain certain unchivalrous elements. Since the battle must typically be fought until one of the participants dies, it should follow that chivalry will not play a large role in such a battle. This is especially true if one equates chivalry with the type of knighthood practised by an Arthurian knight. In a typical trial by combat, such as that portrayed in the Morold battle, the goal of each knight is to kill the other knight using whatever means possible. In this respect, then, the Morold battle succeeds admirably in providing a realistic portrayal of what an actual thirteenth century trial by combat might have looked like.

Despite the negative critique of the Morold battle by some critics there are two aspects of this trial by combat which serve to extenuate the hero's possible unchivalrous actions in battle.

Firstly, there is the issue of justice, which is an important component of a trial by combat. The importance of justice in the Morold battle is emphasized by Tristan's comments which, at various times, include references to both the injustice of the current situation and the need for restoration of justice (Tristan 6147-55, 6183-86, 6285-87, 6296-99; 7075-78). As a defender of justice, Tristan's goal, then, is to fight for justice no matter what the consequence. Thus, his goal must take precedence over all else, including the methods employed to achieve the goal in question. In other words, justice supersedes chivalry as it must in any realistic portrayal of a trial by combat.

Secondly, there is the issue of good versus evil. Since the premise of a trial by combat is that God will allow the good knight, that is to say, the one with the just cause, to be victorious, it follows that this issue will be an important one. Gottfried clearly underlines the importance of this issue by emphasizing the participation of God (especially with respect to Tristan) in the Morold battle. One way in which the poet achieves his objective is by having Tristan make numerous references to God; more so in fact than did his predecessor, Tristram (Tristan 6102, 6112, 6120-28, 6139-98, 6235-41, 6254, 6308-09, 6325, 6422-28, 6450-53, 6468, 6760, 6778-82). In this way, the poet lends divine support to Tristan's cause and, at the same time, alludes to Tristan's eventual victory in battle.[93]

Another way in which Gottfried signals divine support of

---

[93] Cf. W. T. H. Jackson, The Anatomy of Love 150, who observes: "Tristan has all the divine powers on his side, for his cause is morally if not legally impeccable." Jackson's statement that Tristan's cause is morally impeccable is accurate. He errs, however, in casting doubt upon the legality of the protagonist's cause. The text clearly states that the agreement between England and Ireland allows a champion (i.e. Tristan) to challenge Morold as a way of circumventing payment of the tribute (Tristan 5956-69, 6358-76).

Tristan's cause is through his characterization of Tristan's opponent, Morold. In a deviation from the source work, various comments are made concerning Morold, insinuating that he is in some way in league with the Devil (Tristan 6213, 6851, 6906). The implication is clear. If Morold is an instrument of God's arch-rival, the Devil, then Tristan must be carrying out God's will. Consequently, Tristan must represent good and Morold evil.

The poet's use of allegory also indicates that Tristan's cause enjoys God's blessing. An allegory is introduced in which Tristan is assisted by God (got), right/justice (reht), and a willing heart (williger muot) in his battle against Morold, who is said to have the strength of four men (Tristan: lines 6866-6900).[94] Gottfried's listing of God (got) and justice (reht) as the first and second members, respectively, of Tristan's "army" is important. Tristan's cause is thereby shown to be strongly supported by God, since not only is God the first member of the "army," but the second member, justice, is, in the medieval world, synonymous with God's will.

In addition to his use of allegory, the author also employs various allusions to the Trinity to illustrate further divine support of his hero's cause. One such allusion, which is supplemental to the source text, is the three-day wait for the battle.[95]

As with the issue of justice, the issue of good versus

---

[94] Cf. Félix Piquet, L'originalité de Gottfried de Strasbourg dans son poème de Tristan et Isolde. (Lille, France: l'université de Lille, 1905), 157. Piquet suggests that Gottfried's allegory may have been inspired by a similar one in Hartmann's Iwein. He comments: "Notre poète a été conduit à cette allegorie par un passage de l'Iwein de Hartmann [Iwein: line 5273], où un chevalier lutte à forces égales contre trois champions, assisté qu'il est par Dieu et la verité."

[95] See Footnote #86.

evil is important in the Morold battle. As has already been demonstrated, the protagonist's references to God, Morold's alleged devilish nature, the allegory, and the allusions to the Trinity all clearly serve the function of depicting Tristan as good and Morold as evil. As God's champion, then, Tristan must kill Morold, since good must ultimately triumph over evil. Therefore any unchivalrous actions on Tristan's part are, within the context of a trial by combat, less important than the fact that his victory over Morold represents the triumph of good over evil as well as justice over injustice.[96]

A final point to be made regarding this battle is that it provides us with valuable insight into Gottfried's conception of knighthood. In this respect, it is helpful to compare and contrast the two adversaries featured in this battle, Tristan and Morold. Tristan, who appears to represent Gottfried's ideal knight, is humble. He freely admits that his battle experience pales in comparison with that of Morold (Tristan 6178-83). In addition, he offers to fight Morold only if no one else will (Tristan 6147-59).[97] In contrast, Morold is proud and arrogant (Tristan 6217). Evidence of this is the fact that, prior to the actual battle, he rides

---

[96] Cf. Spahr 81, who notes: "And the result of any such battle must be the annihilation of the opposition. As God will conquer the Devil, as justice will triumph over injustice, as the knight's eagerness to do battle in a just cause will win over battle without purpose, so also must Tristan destroy Morolt. The implications of the scene now become apparent. Tristan must kill Morolt, whether it be in a chivalric fashion or not." However, it must be noted that the means used by Tristan to kill Morold are probably limited by the fact that if he uses wicked means, he could possibly lose God's support of his cause.

[97] His French counterpart, Tristram, on the other hand, offers to fight Morold if no one better than he is found (Tristram 39). It appears that the German poet has made his protagonist more humble in order to accentuate the difference between Tristan and Morold.

arrogantly around the island (Tristan 6744-52).[98]

Another observation is that Tristan maintains great faith in God. In addition to his many references to God, he categorically states to King Marke prior to the battle that victory is dependent upon God's power (Tristan 6764-66, 6778-83). Correspondingly, Morold appears to have no faith in God. Gottfried tells us that his defeat was due to his having had faith in his own strength, rather than in God (Tristan 7223-30).

Clearly, this scene does not seem to square well with the view of God presented in the trial by ordeal scene involving Isolde. In this scene, Isolde carefully words the oath she swears shortly before grasping the hot iron to test her faithfulness to her husband, King Marke. In this way, she passes the test unscathed, thereby proving her innocence. Gottfried subsequently remarks that Christ is like a windblown sleeve, accommodating those who know how to phrase their request correctly (Tristan 15697-15750).

One possible explanation for Gottfried's rather unorthodox view of God could be that it is related to his conception of love. In the source work, Thomas' comments immediately following the trial by ordeal scene suggest that God showed Isolde mercy (Tristram 94). Such a statement implies that the love shared by Tristan and Isolde is, in some way, sinful. It is possible that Gottfried, who condones this adulterous love, alters these comments concerning God's part in the trial by ordeal in order to remove any suggestion that Isolde needed to be forgiven for having partaken of such a love.[99]

---

[98] It should be noted that, according to Catholic teaching, pride/arrogance is considered to be one of the Seven Deadly Sins of Man.

[99] Cf. W. T. H. Jackson, The Literature of the Middle Ages (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962) 153. Jackson notes: "His statement about the oath is the reflection of an

The following can be concluded with respect to Gottfried's conception of knighthood. Knighthood, in Gottfried's view, appears not to be solely dependent upon the possession of certain physical qualities such as strength in the case of Morold (Tristan 6173-77, 6510-13, 6877-80, 7158-60). Neither does knighthood appear to be related only to the knight's willingness to do battle. It will be recalled that Tristan was seriously wounded when he relied solely upon his determination to do battle with Morold (Tristan 6919-95).[100] Rather, knighthood, for Gottfried, seems to require the knight to be humble and have faith in God. Once the knight trusts in God rather than in himself in his determination to fight for a just cause (williger muot, got, and reht) only then can he be victorious in battle.[101]

---

intelligent man on such barbarous methods of arriving at 'truth.' His concept of love stands far above that of the writers of romance who pay lip service to Christianity, but show their heroes and heroines breaking all its principles merely for pleasure. It is on this last term that we must insist. For Gottfried, love was not merely pleasure. It was a spiritual experience, at its greatest, the noblest possible experience. Love itself had become a religion." Cf. Norris J. Lacey et al., eds., The New Arthurian Encyclopedia (New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1991) 210. "However we read the passage, it is hard to escape the conclusion that it is based on some highly unmedieval suspension of the reverence appropriate to the name of Christ. This and other ambiguous uses of Christian symbolism and thought urge on us the conclusion that Gottfried's relationship to Christianity is troubled and unorthodox. Despite the best efforts of modern scholars, it remains unexplained."

[100] Spahr 74, notes: "Interpreting the allegory on its first level, we may say that Tristan, engrossed in the immediate issue of battle, has forgotten his loftier purpose and is fighting only for the joy of battle, relying solely upon his williger muot, which is, however, directed toward the defeat of his adversary."

[101] Cf. Spahr 75, who cites Gottfried's allegory as serving "to present a morality of battle, in which it is shown that the knight who fights without a higher purpose is prone physically to defeat, even to death, and morally to

Although Gottfried's conception of knighthood appears to downgrade the physical aspects of chivalry, this need not be seen as a repudiation of knighthood on the part of the poet. The German poet simply wishes to stress that the justness of the knight's cause as well as the knight's inner conviction are more important than how strong or experienced a knight he is.

3. Battle with the Giant Urgan

After Tristan's battle with Morold, he embarks upon a trip to Ireland where, through deception, he is able to enlist the aid of Morold's sister in successfully treating his potentially fatal wound caused by Morold's poisoned sword.

Sometime later, Tristan returns to Ireland in order to woo the lovely Isolde, daughter of the King of Ireland (whose beauty had captivated him on his first trip to Ireland), on behalf of his uncle, King Marke. He achieves his goal by slaying a fierce dragon which has plagued the Irish kingdom. Whoever slays the dragon is automatically entitled to the hand of Isolde in marriage and, consequently, Tristan, acting as King Marke's proxy, wins Isolde, who subsequently marries King Marke.[102] What follows is a period of romance and intrigue, none of which, however, has any bearing on the discussion of knighthood in Gottfried's work.

A considerable time later, Tristan travels to Swales to visit his friend, Duke Gilan (Tristan 15765-770). While there, he is in a sombre mood due to his absence from Isolde. To lift his spirits, Gilan shows him a magical, fabulously

---

discouragement and despair."

[102] Tristan's behaviour in this battle is typical of how one would expect a knight to behave when fighting a dragon. Since neither the actual battle itself nor Tristan's actions in it receive any critical scrutiny, the dragon battle has not been included in our discussion of Tristan's battles as a knight.

coloured dog named Petitcrü. The dog wears around its neck a chain with a tiny bell whose chime can calm and bring joy to even the most restless heart (Tristan 15791-859). Tristan is so taken with the dog that he wishes to acquire it for Isolde, but is certain that Gilan would not be willing to part with it (Tristan 15860-914).

As luck would have it for Tristan, Gilan's duchy is beset by and subject to a giant named Urgan who has come to collect his tribute of various livestock (Tristan 15915-938). Tristan quickly takes advantage of the situation and asks Gilan what he would give him were he to free Gilan from payment of the tribute. Gilan replies that he would be willing to part with all his worldly belongings (Tristan 15939-957). Thus, Tristan has his horse and armour quickly brought to him and heads off in search of Urgan (Tristan 15958-962).

Tristan soon spots Urgan, who apparently has already claimed his tribute, leading livestock towards a bridge. Somehow Tristan manages to arrive at the bridge before Urgan and proceeds to block the giant's path (Tristan 15963-971).

As one might expect, the giant is incensed that someone would block his way. He immediately inquires as to Tristan's purpose and identity. At the same time, he tells Tristan that he will forfeit his life should he not surrender to him (Tristan 15972-986). Tristan responds by introducing himself and informing the giant that he will do everything in his power to prevent him from taking the tribute.

The giant then launches into a brief tirade in which he berates the protagonist for, among other things, his actions in his earlier battle with Morold. He accuses Tristan of having fought for an unjust cause and of having taken Morold's life due to his own arrogance (Tristan 15996-16011).

By making this false accusation, the giant is obviously attempting to strengthen his own position with regard to the tribute. Paradoxically, however, his comments have just the

opposite effect. The reader is well aware that it was Morold rather than Tristan who fought for an unjust cause aided by excessive pride. Consequently, Urgan's statement serves to alert the reader to the fact that it is Urgan, and not Tristan, who embraces an unjust cause.

The battle commences as Urgan hurls a long steel pole, which he carries with him, at Tristan. Tristan succeeds in dodging the pole which strikes his mount, thereby killing it and splitting it into two. The protagonist then retaliates by piercing one of Urgan's eyes with his lance (Tristan 16012-041).

The wounded giant then decides to retrieve his pole, racing to where it had previously landed. As he arrives at the location and reaches for his weapon, however, Tristan strikes him with his sword, cutting off his right hand. He follows up by wounding him in the thigh as well (Tristan 16042-055).

Tristan's opponent reponds by chasing after him while swinging at him with his steel pole. Urgan soon gives up the chase, however. Bleeding profusely from his wounds, the giant makes a hasty retreat, leaving his ill-gotten tribute behind (Tristan 16056-073).

After the giant's departure, Tristan reflects upon what has just transpired. He soon comes to realize that he has no proof of his altercation with Urgan, save for his possession of the livestock. Without such proof, he concludes that Gilan would probably not honour his promise to him (Tristan 16074-089).

Following the trail left by Urgan, Tristan soon arrives at the giant's castle. While the giant is out searching for herbs to aid in the reattachment of his severed hand, Tristan spies the hand and quickly makes off with it. Urgan returns and, upon discovering the hand missing, sets off in pursuit of Tristan. Tristan, who can hear his adversary approaching, hides the appendage under a tree stump (Tristan 16090-131).

Realizing that a fight to the death is inevitable, Tristan takes the initiative, striking Urgan with his lance, which breaks. The giant is in such a rage that he swings wildly at Tristan with his steel pole. In this regard, the poet observes that Tristan is spared death only because Urgan's rage caused him to swing his weapon errantly, thus missing his intended target (Tristan 16132-151).

The battle soon draws to a close as Tristan strikes the giant's remaining good eye. Urgan continues to swing wildly with his weapon, but to no avail. As Urgan steps near the edge of the bridge on which the two combatants have been fighting, Tristan draws upon all his strength, pushing his adversary off the bridge (Tristan 16152-174).

The protagonist retrieves the giant's hand and returns to Gilan's court. After notifying him of what has occurred, Tristan returns with Gilan to the site of the battle, where the two view Urgan's body. The two friends then lead the livestock home, where Tristan is accorded a hero's welcome for his display of courage (Tristan 16175-210).

At Gilan's court, Tristan reminds Gilan of his promise and asks for the dog, Petitcrü. Although he is at first reluctant to do so, Gilan keeps his promise to Tristan. The dog is handed over to Tristan who immediately has it sent to Isolde (Tristan 16211-293).

Literary criticism on the Urgan battle, though sparse, has tended to be divided. W. T. H. Jackson, for instance, views the battle as unchivalrous. In this connection, he notes that " The combat which ensues is as unchivalrous as its predecessor."[103] In addition to viewing the Urgan battle as unchivalrous (due to its similarity with Tristan's encounter with the dragon), W. T. H. Jackson also believes it to be a parody of Iwein's battle with Ascalon. In this respect, he cites "the removal of a part of the victim as

---

[103] Jackson, The Anatomy of Love 153.

proof of victory."[104]

Both points made by W. T. H. Jackson merit further discussion. Firstly, although he is correct in labelling the battle as unchivalrous, it is necessarily so. It is important to remember that Tristan is engaged in battle with an uncourtly creature, not a knight. Evidence of Urgan's uncourtly nature and non-knightly status is the fact that he is a hairy giant who lives in a forest and fights with a long steel bar (rather than with a sword or a lance).[105] As is characteristic in a medieval work, a knight will do battle to the death with an uncourtly creature, such as a dragon or a giant, and is permitted to dispense with the usual rules of chivalry. Thus, Tristan's battle with Urgan, like the giant battles examined earlier in our discussions of Hartmann's Erec and Iwein, is in no way atypical. Lastly, W. T. H. Jackson's claim that this battle was intended to be a parody of Iwein's battle with Ascalon appears to be unfounded. The critic appears not to have taken into account that Tristan's removal of Urgan's hand as proof of victory in this battle scene seems to have been inherited from the source work (cf. Tristan 16077-089/Tristram 98). It is unlikely, then, that this aspect of the Urgan battle was intended to parody Iwein's battle with Ascalon. A more likely explanation is that Tristan's removal of Urgan's hand as proof of victory in Gottfried's work represents the poet's loyalty to his source.

In contrast to W. T. H. Jackson, Piquet deems the Urgan battle to be more courtly in comparison with the source work. Piquet states,

---

[104] Jackson, The Anatomy of Love 153.

[105] Gottfried's reference to Urgan's hirsuteness appears to be a deviation from the source work, which made no such reference (Tristan: lines 15915-15922; 16009-16011/Tristram: pages 96-99). The insertion of this reference appears to be intended to emphasize Urgan's uncourtly status to the point of making him appear sub-human and animalistic.

> L'altercation de Tristan et du géant est plus courtoise dans le poème allemand que chez Thomas, où les adversaires s'appellent truand et monstre maudit.[106]

Piquet makes a valid observation. Prior to the commencement of the Urgan battle, the two adversaries insult one another in the source work, whereas in the German work they are more civil towards one another (cf. Tristan 15978-16011/Tristram 97-98). It is not entirely clear, however, why the German poet felt compelled to make the verbal exchange between Urgan and Tristan more cordial. Perhaps the modification was motivated by Gottfried's desire to make the giant clearly appear to be the aggressor. In the source work, the brief interchange between the two foes could be said to contribute, at least in part, to Urgan's display of antagonism towards Tristan.[107] However, in the German work these harsh words are noticeably absent. The result is that Urgan's attack on Tristan seems less provoked than was the case in the source work.

Despite the more courtly banter between the two rivals, it must still be conceded that this battle and Tristan's actions are unchivalrous. This unchivalrousness is perfectly acceptable, however, since the protagonist is engaged in combat with an uncourtly creature. Consequently, the lack of chivalry in this battle is in no way indicative of an indictment of knighthood on Gottfried's part. To suggest otherwise, one would have to view a poet such as Hartmann as also repudiating knighthood, since his works, such as Erec and Iwein, contain similar depictions of battles with giants.

4. War in Arundel/Life as a Mercenary

---

[106] Félix Piquet, L'originalité de Gottfried de Strasbourg dans son poème de Tristan et Isolde (Lille, France: l'université de Lille, 1905) 271.

[107] Obviously Tristan's blockage of Urgan's path across the bridge is the primary provocation in both the French and the German work.

At a later point in the narrative, the hero, who has once again been separated from Isolde, makes his way to Normandîe. Upon learning of a war in Germany, he departs immediately, believing that knightly deeds would help him to forget his sorrow (Tristan 18438-448).

The poet informs his audience that Tristan performed such exemplary service on behalf of the Holy Roman Empire that no one could match the fame he attained through his knightly deeds of arms. Gottfried notes as well that the number of such deeds is so great that descibing them all would result in a very long story (Tristan 18449-466).

After a period of approximately half a year, Tristan becomes homesick. He leaves Germany and returns to Parmenîe via Normandîe. When he arrives, he is warmly greeted by his foster brothers. The joy of reunion is shortlived, however, as Tristan learns that his foster parents, Rual and Floraete, are dead (Tristan 18601-669).

During this time Tristan mourns the loss of his foster parents. He also spends his time visiting knights and their ladies, hunting and stalking, and participating in tournaments (Tristan 18681-685). In other words, he takes part in knightly activities.

At this time news reaches Parmenîe that a war is underway in a duchy named Arundel, located between Brittany and England. It turns out to be the case that the Duke of Arundel, Jovelin, is fighting a losing battle against rivals whose campaigns against him threaten to reduce his duchy to nothing. Tristan, who views the war as an opportunity to escape his sorrow, promptly departs for Arundel (Tristan 18686-724).

The first order of business for Tristan when he arrives in Arundel is to seek out Duke Jovelin, who resides in a castle named Karke. He soon gains the confidence of the duke and provides him with advice when required. In addition, he makes the acquaintance of the duke's son, Kaedin, which

results in the two knights becoming close friends (Tristan 18720-751).

A brief time later Tristan (accompanied by Kaedin) seeks an audience with the duke, whom he then questions as to the status of the war. Upon receiving information regarding the movements and current position of the enemy troops, Tristan, along with Kaedin and a small group of knights, departs for a castle near enemy lines. From this vantage point the knights conduct periodic raids consisting primarily of burning and pillaging on enemy territory (Tristan 18752-779).

In the meantime, Tristan secretly sends word to Rual's sons in Parmenîe that he is in urgent need of knights. In response, they immediately send him a small army of five hundred knights complete with adequate provisions. The hero rides out to meet the army, leaving half of the knights in Karke with instructions not to respond to enemy aggression until they are certain that he and Kaedin are doing battle there. The remaining two hundred knights return with Tristan to the castle which borders enemy lines (Tristan 18780-816).

The following morning Tristan selects one hundred of the knights. He instructs Kaedin to inform the other knights (both here and in Karke) that they are to come to his aid should he be pursued by the enemy. He then rides across the border, burning and pillaging wherever the possessions of the enemy are to be found (Tristan 18817-832).

Word of this military offensive soon reaches the enemy's leaders, Rugier von Doleise, Nautenis von Hante, and Rigolin von Nante. In preparation, they spend the night assembling all their troops, which number approximately four hundred. The following day they head towards Karke, where they plan to set up camp, as has been their custom (Tristan 18833-855).

On this occasion, however, the rival troops are met by Tristan and his men, who have decided to launch a surprise attack. As Tristan's rivals realize that they are in the midst of battle, they launch their own offensive, riding

towards Tristan and his men. Heavy casualties are inflicted upon both sides, for, as the German poet informs us, all swords and lances appear to have struck their intended targets (Tristan 18856-881).

Noticing that the two armies appear to be evenly matched, the knights who remained at the castle, ride out to assist Tristan and his retinue. They soon break through enemy lines, striking wildly. The result is that the instigators of the original action against the Duke of Arundel (Rudier, Rigolin, and Nautenis) are taken prisoner. The remaining enemy soldiers attempt to flee. Those that are not successful in their attempt are either killed or taken prisoner (Tristan 18882-911).

Having emerged victorious from this encounter, Tristan and his retainers continue onward into enemy territory. Enemies are defeated and their property, cities, and fortresses are confiscated. Booty is sent to Karke. In a short time, all enemy territory falls under the control of Tristan and his warriors (Tristan 18912-932).

With the battle won, Tristan thanks his knights and lets them return home to Parmenîe. The protagonist, who is said to be thoughtful and considerate, then advises that the prisoners be well received. In addition, he recommends that they accept whatever fiefs their lord (presumably Duke Jovelin) decides to return to them along with his pardon. After promising not to engage in any further hostilities possibly arising from this altercation, the instigators and their vassals are allowed to go free. Tristan is then praised at Jovelin's court for both his courage and wisdom (Tristan 18926-935).

Literary criticism on the Arundel episode has tended to be favourable. The primary focus of this criticism has been Tristan's overtures of peace at the end of the war. In this connection, Goldschmidt Kunzer remarks,

> In fact, far-sighted Tristan . . . advises his

> friends to be generous to their prisoners and return their fiefs to them with a pardon. For the third time he has saved someone else's domain from oppression by his cleverness rather than by his warrior's strength. He defeated Morold to rid Mark's lands of Irish oppression as much by his loud display of confidence in justice and divine support as by his skill of arms.[108]

In addition, Piquet observes,

> Ce ne sont pas, chez Gottfried, les adversaires du duc qui implorent la paix: c'est l'avise Tristan qui conseille un accord généreux.[109]

Critics do make a valid observation. The importance of Tristan's conciliatory gestures at the end of the war in Arundel cannot be dismissed. In this respect, it should be noted that these gestures appear to serve first and foremost to present the hero in a very positive light. As well, this act of reconciliation represents a deviation from the source work. Whereas the French work makes brief reference to Tristram's adversaries' seeking to make peace with him, the German work features Tristan providing the impetus for peace and possible reconciliation (cf. Tristram 114/Tristan 18936-948). Thus, the German hero's actions can be said to represent a clear and deliberate attempt by the German poet to enhance the protagonist's image.

The only apparently negative appraisal of the Arundel episode comes from W. T. H. Jackson, who comments,

> . . . there is a brief description of the war in which Tristan aids Kaedin, where the emphasis is not on individual combat but on the grim face of war on the countryside, burning cities and sacked towns.[110]

W. T. H. Jackson's assessment of this episode is not entirely

---

[108] Ruth Goldschmidt Kunzer, The Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg. An Ironic Perspective (Berkeley: University of Californis Press, 1973) 70.

[109] Piquet 306.

[110] W. T. H. Jackson, The Anatomy of Love 153.

without merit. This episode does seem to stress the war in general rather than any individual conflicts during the war. Such emphasis, however, need not be viewed as an indictment of knighthood by Gottfried. It is important to remember in this regard that this scene is almost identical to the corresponding scene in Gottfried's source work (cf. Tristram 114). Hence, the de-emphasis of individual combat does not originate with Gottfried. And, finally, given Gottfried's strong belief in close adherence to the source work (as well as his penchant for realism), it follows that he would retain the flavour of the original scene; and this is indeed the case.

Despite the fact that the protagonist's actions in Arundel have come under very little critical scrutiny, they do merit some discussion. As will be recalled, Tristan's role in the war is that of a mercenary. As is to be expected in a realistic portrayal of a war, Tristan's actions, which include pillage and plunder, are unchivalrous. In this respect, van Winter notes that such actions were typical:

> Soldaten betrachteten Beute häufig als etwas, worauf sie ein Recht hatten und was sie nicht nur der besiegten Bevölkerung, sondern auch den Bauern ihrer eigenen Partei abnehmen konnten. Am berüchtigsten in dieser Hinsicht waren die angeworbenen Soldaten, die im Mittelalter schon seit dem zehnten Jahrhundert neben den Vasalheeren in Erscheinung traten.[111]

Conversely, however, it is Tristan who, in a clear deviation from the source work, is responsible for initiating peace and advocating the return of seized property to those whom the Duke of Arundel deems worthy (Tristan 18936-948). In this regard, the protagonist's actions are chivalrous and appear to approximate the behaviour of what van Winter terms "a true knight." Van Winter remarks,

---

[111] Johanna Maria van Winter, Rittertum-Ideal und Wirklichkeit (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1969) 37.

> Eine weitere Tugend des wahren Ritters, die wohl zu seinem Dienst in der Welt gehörte, war der Verzicht auf Beute und Plünderung.[112]

Although Tristan obviously does not fit the definition of "a true knight," his advocacy for the return of property is an important step in this direction. Thus, Tristan's unchivalrous actions as a mercenary soldier are tempered by his recommendation concerning the confiscated property of the duke's adversaries.

The incongruity of Tristan's actions appears to stem from the German poet's desire to enhance the protagonist's image while retaining and strengthening the realism of the original scene found in the source work. The original scene, provided by Thomas, features Tristram and Kaedin engaged in a war with the duchy's enemies. Gottfried incorporates this scene into his work by modifying it slightly with the apparent aim of more clearly delineating Tristan's role as a mercenary.[113] The result of this modification is that Tristan stands out as being unchivalrous due to his engaging in activities such as burning and pillaging.[114] At the same time, however, the German poet enhances the hero's image by revealing him throughout the course of this scene to be a

---

[112] Van Winter 36.

[113] Notwithstanding the fact that the German poet never expressly refers to Tristan as being a mercenary, his alterations to the text clearly suggest that the protagonist is indeed a mercenary. In this connection, it should be noted that Tristan's brief sojourn in Germany paves the way for his subsequent actions in Arundel, which are most definitely mercenarial in nature (cf. Tristan 18438-448).

[114] Tristan's unchivalrousness as a mercenary may ironically be the result of the poet's desire to make this scene more palatable with respect to knighthood. By stressing Tristan's role as a mercenary (in contrast to the source work where his counterpart is simply a knight pursuing knightly adventure), Gottfried appears to have intended to have Tristan's actions in battle associated with those of a mercenary rather than with those of a knight.

brilliant military strategist and tactician as well as a mediator for peace. In this way, Gottfried is able to provide a realistic scene and, yet also highlight Tristan's more positive qualities.

An important point concerning Tristan's resolution of the conflict in Arundel is that his conciliatory actions are in accordance with the knightly virtues espoused by King Marke at the hero's investiture. The protagonist was advised at that time, among other things, to always be generous to others (Tristan 5035). His proposal, then, that captured property be returned is indicative of his adherence to at least one of the tenets of knighthood mentioned by King Marke. Consequently, this proposal may be viewed as an attempt by Gottfried to have Tristan's actions reflect his own conception of knighthood; a conception of knighthood which, unlike Thomas', does not focus on revenge, but rather, on generosity, which, in turn, leads to reconciliation.

A final item to be discussed is how Tristan's actions compare with those of his father, Riwalin. Since Tristan finds himself in a milieu which is very much like that in which his father lived, a brief comparison is in order. It will be recalled that Riwalin was the sort of knight who engaged in aggression, particularly against his liege lord, Duke Morgan. He also appears to have been the type of knight who placed great value on using his knighthood as a way of obtaining revenge for any wrong done to him (Tristan 269-89). In contrast, Tristan's actions, particularly in this scene, appear to be the opposite of his father's. Tristan is a defender in Arundel, rather than an aggressor, in the sense that the duchy's enemies initiated the altercation long before Tristan's arrival. In addition, at the close of hostilities, Tristan displays a desire to make peace. It is doubtful whether Riwalin would have behaved likewise under similar circumstances.

Whether or not Gottfried intended the Arundel scene to

be Tristan's final battle, it does seem appropriate that it is. For the purpose of our examination of Gottfried's conception of knighthood, this battle is helpful. Not only does it enable us to compare father and son, but it also allows us to see that Tristan has moved away from a knighthood which espouses revenge to one which, at its pinnacle, favours reconciliation over revenge.

E.. Summary

The view of knighthood in Gottfried's Tristan may be gleaned from an examination of the knightly pursuits of the two main protagonists of the work: Riwalin and Tristan.

Riwalin is a knight who operates within the parameters of a pre-courtly world. He is the kind of knight who would engage in hostilities on a whim. In addition, he appears to have attributed a great deal of importance to avenging any wrong done to him (Tristan 269-89).

After the demise of Riwalin, Gottfried's work focuses on the life of Riwalin's son, Tristan. The knighthood practised by Tristan may be seen as a continuation of that of his father albeit with one very important difference. Due to Tristan's orphan status, he is raised by a foster father, Rual. As a result, Tristan receives a more courtly education. Subsequently, at the court of his uncle, King Marke, Tristan is initiated during the Schwertleite episode into a type of knighthood which appears to place great(er) emphasis upon qualities such as loyalty, generosity, and reconciliation.

Loyalty and generosity prove to be important trademarks of Tristan's battles. In the former case, it can be said that all of Tristan's battles are primarily, but not exclusively, motivated by the hero's sense of loyalty to some person. In the latter case, it is noteworthy that in Tristan's final battle (in Arundel) he displays generosity towards his defeated adversaries while operating within a pre-courtly milieu akin to that of his father's.

In conclusion, it may be said that Gottfried promotes a

type of knighthood which stresses loyalty and, to a lesser extent, generosity. Such qualities appear to be more important than external qualities such as strength or knightly prowess. These are taken for granted.

V. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this thesis has been to examine and re-evaluate the conception of knighthood in the Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg. In addition, the Erec and Iwein of Hartmann von Aue were used to illustrate how Gottfried's depiction of knighthood differs from that of his famous predecessor.

The method employed was a close textual analysis of Tristan, focusing specifically, but not exclusively, on the various battle scenes involving the protagonist as well as on any commentary provided by the poet. Comparisons were made, whenever warranted, between Tristan and Hartmann's Erec and/or Iwein. Finally, the Old Norse translation of the Tristram of Thomas of Brittany (Gottfried's source work) was used to determine whether possible deviations from the source work provide any further evidence as to what Gottfried's view of knighthood may have been.

The first work analyzed was Hartmann's Erec. The protagonist is initially an imperfect Arthurian knight whose primary motivation appears to be revenge. His shortcomings as a knight culminate in the verligen episode in which Erec forsakes his knightly duties in favour of marital delights.

When word reaches Erec that the people in Karnant have begun to talk about his dereliction of duty (both as a knight and a king), he and his wife, Enite, leave Karnant. What ensues is a series of battles in which it can be said that Erec defeats opponents who represent negative qualities which Erec himself possesses. As he defeats these opponents, Erec, in turn, also purges himself of these same negative qualities. Once the process has been completed, Erec's final few battles are characterized by the fact that the hero acts out of a sense of compassion.

In conclusion, then, it appears that, in his Erec, Hartmann posits a type of knighthood in which the knight's primary motivation to do battle is his sense of compassion.

This kind of knighthood is non-Arthurian in nature and, hence, Hartmann's advancement of it suggests an implicit criticism of Arthurian knighthood.

The second work analyzed was Hartmann's Iwein. At the start, Iwein is an imperfect Arthurian knight who is so obsessed with honour and recognition that he defies King Arthur by racing to the magic fountain to challenge Ascalon. Iwein slays Ascalon, marries his widow, Laudine, and, then, returns to his life as an Arthurian knight.

The low point of Iwein's career as an Arthurian knight is reached when he devotes himself entirely to the pursuit of knightood at the expense of his relationship with his wife, Laudine. As a result, he loses Laudine which causes him to go mad.

After overcoming his madness Iwein returns to the knightly life. His first act of chivalry is to fight on behalf of the Lady of Narison in gratitude for her having restored Iwein back to courtly society.

The turning point in Iwein's development as a knight occurs when he rescues a lion from a fire-breathing dragon. Thereafter the lion is his constant companion. With the lion at his side, Iwein (who gradually becomes known as the "Knight With The Lion") undertakes a series of battles in which he acts primarily out of a sense of compassion.

In conclusion, then, it appears that, in his Iwein, Hartmann promotes a knightly ideal in which the knight displays compassion by fighting for the oppressed (in fact, more so than was the case in his Erec). In this connection, the role of the lion cannot be overlooked. The lion, which, in my view, represents Christ, aids Iwein in his mission by coming to his rescue whenever he is faced with insurmountable odds. The presence of the lion serves to underscore the fact that Hartmann's ideal of knighthood requires the participation of God. The knight derives honour, but this is not the primary goal.

Hartmann's acceptance of a style of knighthood based upon compassion implies criticism of Arthurian knighthood. This criticism extends as well to the Arthurian concept of âventiure as defined by Kalogrenant.

Such criticism, however, should not be interpreted as constituting an outright rejection of the Arthurian court. In this connection, it may be noted that the Arthurian court remains viable at the end of the work as does the kingdom of Iwein and Laudine. Nonetheless, Hartmann's espousal of a non-Arthurian compassion-based knighthood does serve to both point out the limitations of Arthurian knighthood and to present an alternative.

A final point to be made concerning both Erec and Iwein is that, despite being traditionally viewed as counterparts to one another, they are actually quite similar. Both works feature a flawed Arthurian knight whose shortcomings result in a conflict between love and knighthood. In both instances, the protagonist has quickly risen to the level of king (as well as husband), but has not been prepared for the change due to the speed with which it occurred. Additionally, in both works the hero engages in a series of battles after his crisis with the eventual result being that he comes to embrace a type of knighthood based upon compassion, thereby leaving his former life as an Arthurian knight behind. Lastly, although the Arthurian court remains intact at the end of both Erec and Iwein, its limitations have been pointed out. These limitations may be summarized as follows: the representatives of the Arthurian court are not guided by compassion; they are not selective in taking sides; they are guided by a concept of âventiure which does not allow them to be sufficiently discriminating; and they are self-centred, concerned primarily with gaining fame and honour.

The third and final work analyzed was Gottfried's Tristan. This work has come under much criticism for its alleged negative portrayal of knighthood. Although the view

expressed in this thesis is that much of this criticism is undeserved, it must be conceded that Gottfried's depiction of knighthood is not as idealistic as that of a poet like Hartmann.

There are three main reasons why the depiction of chivalry in Tristan is not as favourable as that in works such as Hartmann's Erec or Iwein.

The first reason for the different depiction of knighthood is that the main theme of Gottfried's Tristan is love, or, more specifically, how love and sorrow are inseparable. Since the poet appears to have chosen this work due to its treatment of love (which here is not linked to knighthood), it follows that knighthood is only of secondary importance to the poet. It should be noted, however, that, since Gottfried's main concern is love, it is highly unlikely that he intended his work to be a polemic against knighthood.

The second reason for the different portrayal of knighthood is the fact that Tristan is a non-Arthurian romance. Whereas Hartmann based his Erec and Iwein on source works provided by Chrétien de Troyes, the originator of the Arthurian romance, Gottfried based his work on that of Thomas of Brittany, whose work is not an Arthurian romance. Since a medieval poet was expected to remain true to his source, one cannot fault Gottfried for not having written an Arthurian romance with correspondingly idealistic depictions of knighthood.

The third and final reason for the different presentation of knighthood is the fact that Gottfried was a poet who strove for as much realism as possible in his work. It should be noted that Gottfried's realistic bent is over and above the greater realism already inherent in a non-Arthurian romance. Since the poet is consistent in attempting to inject as much realism into his work as possible, it is somewhat erroneous to conclude that the realistic depictions of knighthood in Tristan are necessarily the result of the

poet's alleged negative predisposition towards knighthood.

Despite Gottfried's different depiction of knighthood, there is strong evidence which suggests that he is not opposed to knighthood. This evidence comes primarily from our comparison of Tristan with the source work. One such piece of evidence is the observation that Gottfried has, at various times throughout the text, attempted either to remove or, at the very least, to tone down the revenge motif which figured so strongly in Thomas' work. An excellent example of this is Gottfried's alteration of the Schwertleite episode. The king's investiture speech which, in the source work, advised the young protagonist to always return a blow for a blow was transformed by Gottfried into a speech which promoted qualities such as loyalty and generosity.

Another piece of evidence indicating that the German poet is not opposed to knighthood is the observation that he has attempted to provide justification, whenever possible, for Tristan's instances of unchivalrous behaviour. An excellent example of this is the battle with Morold in which Gottfried inserts numerous references to God and justice as well as introducing various Biblical allusions in an attempt to strengthen Tristan's position, thereby mitigating his actions in the battle itself.

It would seem, then, that, in general, Gottfried has tried to give a more positive portrayal of knighthood than that found in his source work. Therefore, it may be concluded that his reputation as an alleged detractor of knighthood is unwarranted.

Having determined that Gottfried viewed knighthood more favourably than has generally been assumed, it remains only to define what his conception of knighthood actually was. To this end, it is necessary to examine the development of the hero, as it relates to that of his father, Riwalin.

It will be recalled that Riwalin was a knight who was part of a pre-courtly world. He engaged in hostilities at the

slightest provocation. His main priority seems to have been to avenge any wrong done to him (Tristan 269-89). There is, however, some indication that this type of knighthood is deficient in that Riwalin, unlike his counterpart, Kanelangres, in the source work, expresses the desire to visit a court in order to learn niuwe ritterschaft (Tristan 454-64/Tristram 4 and 5).

Once Riwalin dies, the focus of Gottfried's work shifts to Riwalin's son, Tristan, who takes up where his father left off, but with one important difference. Instead of being guided by a father who seems to represent revenge, Tristan is raised by marshal Rual who is characterized by his strong sense of loyalty. Later, at his investiture, Tristan is advised by his uncle, King Marke, to always be, among other things, loyal and generous.

These two qualities are very important when one considers Tristan's subsequent battles as a knight. If one examines these battles carefully, it soon becomes apparent that all of Tristan's battles can be said to have been undertaken primarily, but not exclusively, because of the protagonist's loyalty to some person. Generosity plays a no less important role in Tristan's knightly life. It will be recalled that, in a deviation from the source, it is Tristan who, in the pre-courtly milieu of Arundel, displays generosity towards his defeated foes. He thereby demonstrates that he has surpassed his father by favouring reconciliation over revenge.

A final point worth mentioning with respect to Gottfried's conception of knighthood is the possible influence of Hartmann upon Gottfried. At various points throughout Gottfried's work there are possible points of

contact between his work and those of Hartmann.[1] Firstly, it will be recalled from our discussion of the investiture scene that the list of courtly virtues Gottfried adds to King Marke's speech in place of the revenge motif bears a striking resemblance to similar passages in both Hartmann's Erec (cf. Erec 2720-44) and Gregorius (cf. Gregorius 248=58). In addition, the list of courtly virtues in King Marke's speech is also similar to the definition of Arthurian knighthood found in CHAPTER I.[2] Secondly, it will be recalled that Tristan's comments just prior to his investiture concerning the incompatibility of idleness with knightly honour are reminiscent of similar comments found in both Hartmann's Erec (cf. Erec 2966-73) and Iwein (cf. Iwein 2783-94). Thirdly, and lastly, it will be recalled that, in a deviation from the source work, Tristan nearly loses his life in the battle with Morold until God (the third member of the allegory consisting of right/justice [reht], a willing heart [williger muot], and God [got]) comes to his rescue, just as Iwein survived his various battles when the lion, who represents Christ, came to his rescue (Iwein 5050-62, 5375-88, 6737-94). These various points of contact between the works of the two poets suggest the possibility that Gottfried based his conception of knighthood upon Hartmann's model.

Furthermore, it may also be suggested that Gottfried took Hartmann's model of ideal knighthood a step further by incorporating into it the aspect of Christian love. This latter development appears to be evident in the Arundel scene in which it is Tristan who, in an act of Christian charity, both initiates peace and advocates the return of seized

---

[1] It will be recalled from the literary excursus section of the investiture scene that Gottfried was both familiar with and an admirer of Hartmann's work (cf. Tristan 4621-37).

[2] See CHAPTER I page 10. It should not, however, be inferred that Tristan practises Arthurian knighthood.

property to those whom the Duke of Arundel deems worthy (Tristan 18936-948).

In conclusion, then, Gottfried's conception of knighthood seems to take Hartmann's conception of knighthood and imbue it with Christian love; an act which seems particularly appropriate for a work that is dedicated to the edelen herzen: a group of people who know that true love and sorrow are inseparable. As well, Gottfried's conception of knighthood seems to promote discussion of internal rather than external qualities. Qualities such as loyalty, generosity, modesty, discretion, courtliness, a willing heart, a just cause, and a belief in God appear to be just as important to the knight's success as external qualities such as physical strength or knightly prowess.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Works

Brackert, Helmut., ed. and trans. Das Nibelungenlied. 1. Teil. Mittelhochdeutscher Text und Übertragung. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH., 1986.

Gottfried von Straßburg. Tristan. 3rd ed. in 3 volumes. Ed. and trans. Rüdiger Krohn. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1984, 1985, 1981.

---. Tristan. With the 'Tristram' of Thomas. Trans. A. T. Hatto. Markham: Penguin Books Canada, 1985.

Hartmann von Aue. Erec: Mittelhochdeutscher Text und Übertragung. Ed. and trans. Thomas Cramer. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1984.

---. Iwein. ed. and trans. Patrick M. McConeghy. New York: Garland Publishing, 1984.

---. Gregorius der gute Sünder. Trans. Burkhard Kippenberg. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., 1983.

Schach, Paul., ed. and trans. The Saga of Tristram and Isönd. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1973.

Wolfram von Eschenbach. Parzival. Study ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1965.

Secondary Works

Anson, John S. "The Hunt of Love: Gottfried von Strassburg's Tristan As Tragedy." Speculum 45 (1970): 594-607.

Arentzen, Jörg and Uwe Ruberg., eds. Die Ritteridee in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters. Eine kommentierte Anthologie. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1987.

Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis: dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der abendländischen Literatur. 2nd expanded ed. Bern: Francke Verlag, 1959.

Batts, Michael S. Gottfried von Straßburg. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1971.

Bekker, Hugo. Gottfried von Strassburg's Tristan: Journey through the Realm of Eros. Columbia, South Carolina: Camden House, 1987.

Betz, Werner. "Gottfried von Straßburg als Kritiker höfischer Kultur und Advokat religiöser Emanzipation." Gottfried von Straßburg Ed. Alois Wolf. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973: 518-525.

Beutin, Wolfgang. "Zum Lebensweg des 'Helden' in der mhd. Dichtung (Erec, Iwein, Tristan, Parzival). Bemerkungen aus psychoanalytischer Sicht." Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik 7.26 (1977): 39-57.

Bindschedler, Maria. "Die Dichtung um König Artus und seine Ritter." Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 31 (1957): 84-100.

Boggs, Roy. "Hartmann's Erec." Innovation in Medieval Literature: Essays to the Memory of Alan Markman Ed. Douglas Radcliff-Umstead. Pittsburgh: Medieval Studies Committee, University of Pittsburgh, 1971.

Borck, Karl Heinz. "Über Ehre, Artuskritik und Dankbarkeit in Hartmanns Iwein." Die Ehre als literarisches Motiv. E. W. Herd zum 65. Geburtstag Ed. August Obermayer. Dunedin, N. Z.: Department of German, University of Otago, 1988: 1-18.

Bouchard, Constance B. "The Possible Nonexistence of Thomas, Author of Tristan and Isolde." Modern Philology 79 (1981): 66-72.

Brandt, Wolfgang. "Die Entführungsepisode in Hartmanns 'Iwein'." Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 99 (1980): 20-28.

Bräuer, Rolf. "Reichspolitik, Artusidealität und Tristanminne. Soziokulturelle und ideologische Determinanten der feudalklassischen deutschen literatur." Zeitschrift für Germanistik (Leipzig). 6 (1985): 189-199.

Brogsitter, Karl O. Artusepik. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965.

Bumke, Joachim. Studien zum Ritterbegriff im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag, 1964.

Buschinger, Danielle. "Die Tristan-Sage im deutschen Mittelalter." Zur gesellschaftlichen Funktionalität mittelalterlicher deutscher Literatur Ed. President of the Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität. Greifswald: Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität, 1984 67-88.

---. "Das Bild des Kaufmanns im Tristan-Roman und bei Wolfram von Eschenbach." Zeitschrift für Germanistik

(Leipzig). 8 (1987): 532-543.

Capellanus, Andreas. The Art of Courtly Love. Trans. John Jay Parry. New York: Columbia University, 1941.

Combridge, Rosemary Norah. Das Recht im 'Tristan' Gottfrieds von Strassburg. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1964.

Cormeau, Christoph and Wilhelm Störmer. Hartmann von Aue. Epoche-Werk-Wirkung. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1985.

Cosman, Madeleine Pelner. The Education of the Hero in Arthurian Romance. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1966.

de Boor, Helmut. Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung, Blüte, Ausklang 1170-1250. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1953.

---. "Die Grundauffassung von Gottfrieds Tristan." Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 18 (1940): 262-306.

Drosdowski, Günther et al., eds. Meyers Enzyklopädisches Lexikon. Deutsches Wörterbuch. Vol. 32. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut AG, 1981.

Ehrismann, Gustav. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. Vol. 2, part 2, 1st half. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927.

Emmel, Hildegard. Formprobleme des Artusromans und der Gralsdichtung. Bern: A. Francke AG Verlag, 1951.

Endres, Rolf. Einführung in die mittelhochdeutsche Literatur. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Ullstein GmbH., 1971.

---. "Die Bedeutung von 'güete' und die Diesseitigkeit der Artusromane Hartmanns." Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 44 (1970): 595-612.

Fischer, Hubertus. Ehre, Hof und Abenteuer in Hartmanns "Iwein". Vorarbeiten zu einer historischen Poetik des höfischen Epos. Munich: Fink, 1983.

Frey, Winfried; Walter Raitz; Dieter Seitz. Einführung in die deutsche literatur des 12. bis 16. Jahrhunderts. Vol. 1. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1979.

Fromm, Hans. "Tristans Schwertleite." Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 41 (1967): 333-350.

Frye, Northrop, Sheridan Baker, and George Perkins. The Harper Handbook to Literature. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

Gillespie, George T. "Real and Ideal Images of Knightly Endeavour and Love in the Works of Hartmann von Aue." Hartmann von Aue. Changing Perspectives: London Hartmann Symposium 1985 Eds. Timothy McFarland and Silvia Ranawake. Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1988, 253-270.

Giloy-Hirtz, Petra. "Der imaginierte Hof." Höfische Literatur, Hofgesellschaft, Höfische Lebensformen um 1200. Kolloquium am Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung der Universität Bielefeld, 3.-5. Nov. 1983 Eds. Gert Kaiser und Jan-Dirk Müller. Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1986: 253-273, 274-275.

Green, Dennis Howard. "Hartmann's Ironic Praise of Erec." Modern Language Review 70 (1975): 795-807.

Grundmann, Karl. Studien zur Speerkampfschilderung im Mittelhochdeutschen. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des höfischen Stil- und Lebensgefühls. Warsaw: Josef Piludski University, 1939.

Gürttler, Karin R. 'Künec Artus der guote.' Das Artusbild der höfischen Epik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts. Bonn: Bouvier Verlag Herbert Grundmann, 1976.

Hatto, A. T. " 'Der Aventiure meine' in Hartmanns Iwein." Mediaeval German Studies. Presented to Frederick Norman Professor of German in the University of London by his Students, Colleagues and Friends on the occasion of his retirement Ed. Institute of Germanic Studies, London University. London: Institute of Germanic Studies, London University, 1965: 94-103.

Haug, Walter. "âventiure in Gottfrieds von Straßburg Tristan." Festschrift für Hans Eggers Ed. Herbert Backes. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1972, 88-125.

Heimerle, Magda. Gottfried und Thomas. Ein Vergleich. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Moritz Diesterweg, 1942.

Hruby, Antonin. "Die Problemstellung in Chrétiens und Hartmanns 'Erec'." Hartmann von Aue Eds. Hugo Kuhn and Christoph Cormeau. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973: 342-372.

Huber, Christoph. Gottfried von Straßburg. "Tristan und Isolde". Eine Einführung. Munich: Artemis Verlag, 1986.

Jackson, William Henry. "Das Turnier in der deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters." Das ritterliche Turnier im Mittelalter Ed. Josef Fleckenstein. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987: 257-295.

---. "The Tournament in the Works of Hartmann von Aue. Motifs, Style, Functions." Hartmann von Aue. Changing Perspectives: London Hartmann Symposium 1985 Eds. Timothy McFarland and Silvia Ranawake. Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1988: 233-251.

Jackson, W. T. H. "The Literary Views of Gottfried von Straßburg." Publications of the Modern Language Association 85 (1970): 992-1001.

---. "Tristan the Artist in Gottfried's Poem." Publications of the Modern Language Association 77 (1962): 364-372.

---. The Anatomy of Love. The Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg. New York: Columbia University, 1971.

---. The Literature of the Middle Ages. New York: Columbia University, 1962.

Jacobsen, Evelyn M. "The Unity of wort and sinn: Language as Theme and Structural Element in Hartmann's Erec." Seminar. A Journal of Germanic Studies 27.2 (1991): 121-135.

Jaeger, C. Stephen. Medieval Humanism in Gottfried von Straßburg's Tristan und Isolde. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag, 1977.

Kaiser, Gert. Textauslegung und gesellschaftliche Selbstdeutung. Die Artusromane Hartmanns von Aue. 2nd newly rev. ed. Wiesbaden: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, Athenaion, 1978.

Kästner, Hannes. Harfe Und Schwert. Der höfische Spielmann bei Gottfried von Straßburg. Tübingen: Niemeyer Verlag, 1981.

Keen, Maurice. Chivalry. New Haven: Yale University, 1984.

Keferstein, Georg. "Die Entwertung der höfischen Gesellschaft im Tristan Gottfrieds von Straßburg." Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift 24 (1936): 421-440.

Keller, Thomas L. "Iwein and the lion." Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik 15 (1980): 59-75.

Kolb, Herbert. "Der Hof und die Höfischen. Bemerkungen zu

Gottfried von Straßburg." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum 106 (1977): 236-252.

Kraft, Karl-Friedrich O. Iweins triuwe. Zu Ethos und Form der Aventiurenfolge in Hartmanns 'Iwein'. Eine Interpretation. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1979.

Kuhn, Hugo. " 'Erec'." Hartmann von Aue Eds. Hugo Kuhn and Christoph Cormeau. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973, 17-48.

Kunzer, Ruth Goldschmidt. The Tristan of Gottfried von Straßburg. An Ironic Perspective. Berkeley: University of California, 1973.

Küsters, Urban. "Liebe zum Hof. Vorstellungen und Erscheinungsformen einer "höfischen" Lebensordnung in Gottfrieds Tristan." Höfische Literatur, Hofgesellschaft, Höfische Lebensformen um 1200. Kolloquium am Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung der Universität Bielefeld, 3.-5. Nov. 1983 Eds. Gert Kaiser and Jan-Dirk Müller. Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1986: 141-175, 175-176.

Lacy, Norris J. et al., eds. The New Arthurian Encyclopedia. New York: Garland Publishing, 1991.

Langer, Otto. "Der Künstlerroman Gottfrieds-Protest bürgerlicher Empfindsamkeit gegen höfisches Tugendsystem?" Euphorion 68 (1974): 1-41.

Lederer, Herbert. Reference Grammar of the German Language. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.

Lewis, Robert E. "Erec's knightly imperfections. Res Publica Litterarum: Studies in the classical Tradition 5.2 (1982): 151-158.

Lexer, Matthias. Mittelhochdeutsches Taschenwörterbuch. 37th ed. Stuttgart: S. Hirzel Verlag, 1983.

Loomis, R.S. Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages. Oxford: Oxford University, 1959.

McConeghy, Patrick M. "Aventiure and anti-aventiure in Ulrich von Zatzikhoven's Lanzelot and Hartmann von Aue's Iwein." Germanic Review 57 (1982): 60-69.

---. "Women's Speech and Silence in Hartmann von Aue's Erec." Publications of the Modern Language Association of America 102 (1987): 772-783.

McFarland, Timothy and Silvia Ranawake., eds. Hartmann von Aue. Changing Perspectives: London Hartmann Symposium 1985. Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1988.

McFarland, Timothy. "Narrative Structure and the Renewal of the Hero's Identity in Iwein." Hartmann von Aue. Changing Perspectives: London Hartmann Symposium 1985 Eds. Timothy McFarland and Silvia Ranawake. Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1988: 129-157.

Meng, A. Vom Sinn des ritterlichen Abenteuers bei Hartmann von Aue. Zürich: Juris Verlag, 1967.

Mertens, Volker. " 'Iwein' und 'Gwigalois'-der Weg zur Landesherrschaft." Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift 31 (1981): 14-31.

Mohr, Wolfgang. "Tristan und Isold als Künstlerroman." Euphorion 53 (1959): 153-174.

---. "Iweins Wahnsinn. Die Aventüre und ihr 'Sinn'." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum 100 (1971): 73-94.

Nagel, Bert. Staufische Klassik. Deutsche Dichtung um 1200. Heidelberg: Lothar Stiehm Verlag, 1977.

Naumann, Hans and Günther Müller., eds. Höfische Kultur. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1929.

Naumann, Hans. "Ritterliche Standeskultur um 1200." Höfische Kultur Eds. Hans Naumann and Günther Müller. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1929, 1-77.

Noble, Cecil A. M. "Gottfried von Straßburg's Tristan und Isolt-Courtly and Uncourtly." Cecil A. M. Noble: Spielbewußtsein. Essays zur deutschen Literatur und Sprache Bern: Verlag Peter Lang AG, 1981: 85-92.

Piquet, Félix. L'originalité de Gottfried de Strasbourg dans son poème de Tristan et Isolde. Lille, France: l'université de Lille, 1905.

Pütz, Horst Peter. "Auf der Suche nach der Aventiure." AUGIAS 23 (1986): 5-30.

---. "Artus-Kritik in Hartmanns 'Iwein'." Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift 22 (1972): 193-197.

Ranawake, Silvia. "Erec's verligen and the Sin of Sloth." Hartmann von Aue. Changing Perspectives: London Hartmann Symposium 1985 Eds. Timothy McFarland and Silvia Ranawake. Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1988: 93-115.

Robertshaw, Alan. "Ambiguity and Morality in Iwein." Hartmann von Aue. Changing Perspectives: London Hartmann Symposium 1985 Eds. Timothy McFarland and Silvia Ranawake. Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1988: 117-128.

Ruh, Kurt. Höfische Epik des deutschen Mittelalters Vols. 1 & 2. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1967, 1980.

---. "Zur Interpretation von Hartmanns 'Iwein'." Hartmann von Aue, eds. Hugo Kuhn and Christoph Cormeau. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973, 408-425.

Salmon, Paul. " 'âne zuht'; Hartmann von Aue's Criticism of Iwein." Modern Language Review 69 (1974): 556-561.

---. Literature in Medieval Germany. New York: Barnes & Noble Inc., 1967.

Scheunemann, Ernst. Artushof und Abenteuer. Breslau: Maruschke & Berendt, 1937.

Schmitz, Heinz-Günter. "Iweins zorn und tobesucht. Psychologie und Physiologie in mittelhochdeutscher Literatur." Sandbjerg 85. Dem Andenken von Heinrich Bach gewidmet Eds. Friedhelm Debus und Ernst Dittmer. Neumünster: Wachholtz, 1986: 87-111.

Schneider, Hermann. Heldendichtung, Geistlichendichtung, Ritterdichtung. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag, 1943.

Schröder, Werner. "Die von Tristande hant gelesen. Quellenhinweise und Quellenkritik im Tristan Gottfrieds von Straßburg." Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum 104 (1975): 307-338.

See, Geoffrey. "An Examination of the Hero in Hartmann's Erec." Seminar. A Journal of Germanic Studies 27.1 (1991): 39-54.

Sieverding, Norbert. Der ritterliche Kampf bei Hartmann und Wolfram. Seine Bewertung im 'Erec' und 'Iwein' und in den Gachmuret- und Gawan-Büchern des 'Parzival'. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag, 1985.

Sinka, Margit M. " 'Der höfschste man': an analysis of Gawein's role in Hartmann von Aue's Iwein." Modern Language Notes 96 (1981): 471-487.

Smits, Kathryn. "Einige Beobachtungen zu gemeinsamen Motiven in Hartmanns Erec und Wolframs Parzival." Festschrift für E. W. Herd Ed. August Obermayer. Dunedin, N. Z.:

Department of German, University of Otago, 1980: 251-262.

---. "Enite als christliche Ehefrau." Interpretation und Edition deutscher Texte des Mittelalters. Festschrift für John Asher Eds. Kathryn Smits et al. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1981: 13-25.

---. "Die Schönheit der Frau in Hartmanns 'Erec'." Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 101 (1982): 1-28.

Spahr, Blake Lee. "Tristan versus Morolt: Allegory Against Reality?" Festschrift für Helen Adolf Eds. S. Z. Buehne et al. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing, 1968, 72-85.

Stapel, Wilhelm. "Die Gralsburg und die Minneburg." Wolfram-Jahrbuch Ed. Wolfgang Stammler. Mittenberg: Gottlob Volkhardtsche Druckerei, 1952, 28-35.

Stavenhagen, Lee. "Rual der werde/ein wunder uf der erde." Neophilologus 68 (1984): 400-404.

Stein, Peter K. "Tristans Schwertleite. Zur Einschätzung ritterlich-höfischer Dichtung durch Gottfried von Straßburg." Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 51 (1977): 300-350.

Steinhoff, Hans Hugo. Bibliographie zu Gottfried von Straßburg. Vols. 1 & 2. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1971, 1986.

Stolte, Heinz. "Drachenkampf und Liebestrank. Zur Geschichte der Tristandichung." Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 18 (1940): 250-261.

Tax, Petrus W. "Tristans Kampf mit Urgan in Gottfrieds Werk: Eine Psychomachie der Liebe?" Michigan Germanic Studies 3 (1977): 44-53.

---. "Studien zum Symbolischen in Hartmanns Erec. Erecs ritterliche Erhöhung." Wirkendes Wort. 13 (1963): 277-288.

Tomasek, Tomas. "Moral und Menschenbild in den mittelalterlichen Tristandichtungen." Sandbjerg 85. Dem Andenken von Heinrich Bach gewidmet Eds. Friedhelm Debus und Ernst Dittmer. Neumünster: Wachholtz, 1986: 113-139.

Träger, Claus., ed. Wörterbuch der Literaturwissenschaft. Leipzig: Veb Bibliographisches Institut, 1986.

Van Winter, Johanna Maria. Rittertum - Ideal und Wirklichkeit. Munich: Verlag C. B. Beck, 1969.

Von Wilpert, Gero. Sachwörterbuch der Literatur. 6th improved and expanded ed. Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1979.

Wapnewski, Peter. Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

---. Hartmann von Aue. 7th ed. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1979.

Weber, Gottfried and Werner Hoffmann. Gottfried von Straßburg. 5th ed. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1981.

Welz, Dieter. "The Spirit of Adventure in MHG. Romances of the Arthurian Cycle. Hartmann von Aue and Gottfried von Straßburg." English Studies in Africa 16 (1973): 77-86.

---. "Glück und Gesellschaft in den Artusromanen Hartmanns von Aue und im Tristan Gottfrieds von Straßburg." Acta Germanica 6 (1971): 11-40.

Wentzlaff-Eggebert, Friedrich-Wilhelm. "Ritterliche Lebenslehre und antike Ethik." Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift 23 (1949): 252-273.

Wenzel, Horst. "Ze hove und ze holze-offenlîch und tougen. Zur Darstellung und Deutung des Unhöfischen in der höfischen Epik und im Nibelungenlied." Höfische Literatur, Hofgesellschaft, Höfische Lebensformen um 1200. Kolloquium am Zentrum der Universität Bielefeld, 3.-5. Nov. 1983 Eds. Gert Kaiser and Jan-Dirk Müller. Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1986, 277-299; 299-300.

Willson, Harold Bernard. "The role of Keii in Hartmann's Iwein." Medium Aevum 30 (1961): 145-158.

Zutt, Herta. "Drachenkämpfe." Bild und Gedanke: Festschrift für Gerhart Baumann zum 60. Geburtstag Ed. Günter Schnitzler. Munich: Fink, 1981, 206-217.

VITA

NAME: Hans Juergen Doerle

PLACE OF BIRTH: Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

YEAR OF BIRTH: October 17, 1963.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION: B.Sc. Specialization in Psychology (University of Alberta, 1985); B.A. Honours in German (University of Alberta, 1988).

HONOURS AND AWARDS: Dean's Honours List, Faculty of Arts, University of Alberta, 1987; Louise McKinney Post-Secondary Scholarship, 1987-88; German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) Scholarship, June 6-July 15, 1988.

RELATED WORK EXPERIENCE: Marker (January-April 1987); Graduate Teaching Assistant (September 1988-April 1989); Graduate Research Assistant (September 1989)-Department of Germanic Languages, University of Alberta.